LIBRARY

2.16.1
3

ST. ALBERT'S COLLEGE LIBRARY

M. Alberti

TRENT

BY FREDERICK J. KINSMAN

SALVE MATER
Crown 8vo (*Third Printing*)

PRINCIPLES OF ANGLICANISM
Crown 8vo.

CATHOLIC AND PROTESTANT
Crown 8vo.

TRENT
Crown 8vo.

LONGMANS, GREEN, AND CO.

OUTLINES OF THE HISTORY OF THE CHURCH

MOREHOUSE PUBLISHING CO.

Stech
135

TRENT

FOUR LECTURES ON PRACTICAL ASPECTS OF THE COUNCIL OF TRENT

BY

FREDERICK JOSEPH KINSMAN

LONGMANS, GREEN AND CO.
FOURTH AVENUE & 30TH STREET, NEW YORK
39 PATERNOSTER ROW, LONDON
BOMBAY, CALCUTTA, AND MADRAS
1921

Nihil Obstat:

JOSEPH BRUNEAU,
Censor Deputatus.

Imprimatur:

✠ JAMES CARDINAL GIBBONS,
Archbishop of Baltimore.

BALTIMORE, MARYLAND, March 6, 1921.

COPYRIGHT, 1921, BY
LONGMANS, GREEN & CO.

All rights reserved

TO MY FATHER

Frederick Kinsman

14,963

ST. ALBERT'S COLLEGE LIBRARY

CONTENTS

CHAPTER		PAGE
I.	The Council of Trent	3
II.	The Protestant Reformation . .	39
III.	The Significance of Trent . . .	67
IV.	The Tridentine Attitude	99

PREFACE

THE four lectures contained in this book, originally prepared for use in Portland, were eventually delivered at St. Mary's Seminary, Baltimore. Their aim is not to give any full account of the Council of Trent, merely to call attention to salient points in its history with a view to their practical significance.

The writer is under obligation to the Reverend Joseph Bruneau, S.S., S.T.D., of St. Mary's Seminary, Baltimore, for helpful criticisms, and to Mr. Frederic George Williams for assistance in preparing manuscript for the press.

The little book is dedicated to the writer's father in whom he is certain of having at least one reader and an indulgent critic. These lectures were written in his company when, during a time of illness and helplessness, already extended over two years, he has exhibited a patience and affectionate considerateness which have made the care of him a privilege and pleasure.

F. J. K.

BIRCHMERE, March 4, 1921.

I

THE COUNCIL OF TRENT

I

The Council of Trent

During the past five hundred years the greatest event in Catholic history was the Council of Trent. In it mediæval Catholicism finds its culmination and modern Catholicism, its beginnings. As may be seen in retrospect, it draws to a focus many differing lines of development belonging to ages and manners that have passed away; and from it radiate the same lines in forms adapted to the needs of the world in recent times. In Christian history, it separates and differentiates what is mediæval from what is modern, and at the same time demonstrates that mediæval and modern are but phases and periods in one age-long process. It discloses how, in the Catholic Church, underlying all changes in application, there is unchanging continuity of principles. The Council of Trent is at once end, beginning, and link. To understand it is to have the clue to the interpretation of Catholicism throughout its history.

It is the purpose of the four papers in this book to call attention to certain salient points in

the Council's significance. No effort has been made to deal with the matters touched upon with any degree of fulness, or to give the history of the Council in detail, merely to sketch certain of its aspects for the purpose of making a few practical generalizations. The object of this, as of any study of the Church in the past, is to learn better what the Church stands for in our own day and generation. The first paper discusses certain superficial aspects of the Council which account for contemporary failure to detect its importance; the second, the character and tendency of the Protestant Reformation which it was summoned to confront; the third, the principles and presuppositions which determined its action; and the fourth, certain aspects of its attitude which have constant practical value.

There are two chief contemporary authorities for the history of Trent, the Jesuit, Cardinal Pietro Sforza Pallavicino, and the Venetian Servite, Fra Paolo Sarpi. The latter was the earlier writer, the former having undertaken the task of correcting Sarpi's version of events at the express request of Pope Alexander VII. Pallavicino's history is the standard work, composed, as it was, with access to all archives of the Council by one personally acquainted with

those who had played leading parts in its discussions, interpreting the Council's acts as it were from the inside, with appreciation of its spiritual ideals and aims. Yet he writes for edification, and though not misrepresenting, glozes over differences of opinion in the Council, and charitably conceals anything suggestive of scandal. Sarpi wrote from an anti-papal bias, and gives a distorted view, not inventing facts, but choosing them with sinister purpose and giving much disproportionate emphasis. His work differs from that of Pallavicino as the story of a sensational reporter does from one given in a textbook for parochial schools: yet his one-sided, hostile view has distinct value, not so much by reflecting his own attitude, as by noting such things as would have struck shrewd laymen of the time, wholly free from ecclesiastical prepossessions. The contrasting accounts of these first historians afford valuable materials for history as well as history itself. With their writings must be associated the *Disputationes Tridentinæ* of the Jesuit theologian James Lainez, which give fully the arguments decisive in determining the form of the Council's definitions of doctrine.*

* The official documents relating to the Council may be conveniently studied in Theiner's *Acta genuina,* 2 vols.

The Council of Trent is nineteenth in the list of œcumenical Councils, and in influence is of the first rank. Most estimates would couple it with the first Council of Nicæa. Yet this view does not correspond to the impression made at the time of its actual sessions, but is due solely to late and deliberate examination of its effects. One living in mountain country has little notion of comparative heights: near foothills loom higher than loftier peaks: a climber can tell little of the relation of his mountains to others during an actual ascent. Only when he has climbed to the top, or travelled far enough to see the whole range at a glance, do the highest peaks stand out in the isolation of pre-eminence. Distance, which lends enchantment, also gives standards of comparative values. So of Trent. The sixteenth century in which it occurred did not think so much of it; the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries were a bit apologetic; the nineteenth and twentieth have been gradually learning its meaning and permanent value.

Upon casual observers of events in the six-

Zagrab, 1874, and in the edition of the *Diaria,* etc., of the *Societas Goerrhesiana,* projected for twelve volumes, of which six have already been published by Herder in Freiburg between the years 1901 and 1919.

teenth century, this meeting of prelates in a small city of the Austrian Tyrol made no very deep impression. It would have seemed to them, if they heard its proceedings discussed, to illustrate the state of things which for three centuries had occasioned a general cry for reform, and also the Church's inability to meet emergencies. The Council was ostensibly bent on reform; yet only in two countries of Europe were its demands promptly complied with. Many would have cited this as proof of the hopelessness of getting tangles in the Church's affairs straightened. They had an uncomfortable sense of there being too much politics in the Church; and Trent was a perfect snarl of politics. There was plainly something wrong that the clamor for readjustment should have become so general. It was not heretics and schismatics, restive under the Church's requirements of obedience, who were making the loudest outcries. The Church's greatest statesmen and saints had been striving for reforms with few intermissions in their efforts for two hundred years. Catholics of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries were neither better nor worse than those of most other times: there were very great saints among them. Yet there was an immense amount of worldliness, of

luxury, of greed, of intrigue with headquarters at Rome, which evoked passionate cries of protest from all who had at heart the honor of the Church. Strenuous efforts to mend matters were made in many quarters, enlisting the best energies of popes, priests and zealous laymen. All these efforts seemed to lead to nothing until after the Tridentine Council. The fifteenth century, in its cult of wealth, pleasure and refined comfort, was very like the nineteenth. That the spirit of the world which invaded the Church in the earlier time was not equally able to do so in the later was due chiefly to the standards fixed for the Church by the epoch-making Council of Trent, the place of which in history can only be understood by relating its achievements to previous efforts at ecclesiastical reform.

These dated from the thirteenth century, which had been the time of the Church's greatest power, grandeur and usefulness. Then it was that the policies of Gregory VII, aiming at Christian domination of Europe, culminated in the pontificate of Innocent III, only to topple toward decline after the ill-starred pontificate of Boniface VIII. The imprisonment of Boniface in Anagni by Philip the Fair of France was followed by the removal of the Popes to Avignon.

This exile, lasting seventy-two years, led to the Great Schism in the Papacy, to end which there was demand for a general council from every part of Europe. The Church, and in particular the Papacy and Curia, had many critics in those days, including such different men as Michael of Cesena, General of the Franciscans, William of Occam, the invincible Doctor of the University of Paris, the poet Dante, mystics like Thomas à Kempis, and lawyers like Marsiglio of Padua. Ever since the tenth century had there been efforts to remove abuses: now these culminated in efforts to obtain the needful remedies through councils. The ecclesiastical history of the fifteenth century is largely conciliar. At its opening, the most obvious task of the Church was to end the papal schism which resulted from the effort of French Kings to keep the Papacy under French influence by prolonging the sojourn at Avignon. From 1378 until 1449 there were two lines of Popes; one in Rome, recognized by Italy, Germany, England, Denmark, Sweden, Poland and Prussia; the other in Avignon, recognized by France, Scotland, Spain, Portugal, Savoy and Lorraine. Allegiance was given to one or the other for purely political reasons; and the prestige of the Papacy suffered severely. The rival pon-

tiffs seemed to lose the character of spiritual persons by their share in many political moves of an unedifying character.

To deal primarily with this situation, three great councils were summoned: the first at Pisa in 1409; the second, the greatest of the three, at Constance in session from 1414 to 1418; the third at Basel, convened in 1431, and theoretically sitting until 1449, when without obvious results it simply fizzled away. None of them succeeded in correcting the worldly spirit in the Church. Certain Popes were deposed and others set up; after almost half a century of conciliar effort the Schism was ended: but other attempts to improve affairs led to little or nothing, and there was a general skepticism as to the usefulness of conciliar machinery. During the latter part of the fifteenth century, the popular cry was not for a Council, but for a *Papa angelicus*. Since he did not appear, there was a disposition to look for remedy of ills in the activity of secular sovereigns. "The age of Councils was succeeded by an age of Concordats." To quote an English historian: "The religious influence of the Church was brought low by its record of failure. The scheme for governing the world by the hierarchy, pursued by three centuries, had

terminated in disaster. For a whole generation no man knew whether the Papacy was in Italy or in France. The attempt to effect improvement through the Councils had been abandoned after many experiments; and the failure to reconcile the Greeks had established the Ottoman Empire in Europe. With the decline of the Church the State rose in power and prerogative, and exercised rights which for centuries had been claimed by the hierarchy. All this did not suggest Lutheranism to Luther, but it prepared the world for it." * Or to quote a Dominican monk, speaking in 1484: "The world cries for a Council; but how can one be obtained in the present condition of the Church. No human power avails any longer to reform the Church through a Council; and God Himself must come to our aid in some way unknown to us." That expresses the feeling with which the fifteenth century ended, conviction of the need of reform in the Church, distrust of the constitutional activities of Pope and Council, readiness to feel that there was justification for methods revolutionary in character. This general feeling that old machinery was past usefulness, that there must be new methods of dealing with new problems, goes far

* Acton: *Lectures on Modern History*, p. 91.

to explain why demagogues of the sixteenth century, who took up the cry of reform as cloak for schemes of destruction, could gain such a hearing and following. The Church's system had for long not been working well; many features of it had come to be discredited; not least of these was its system of general councils. In reply to cries for a Council men pointed to the comparative failure of those in the previous century. All had been assembled in response to general demands; all had proclaimed great plans for reform: and all had dispersed without accomplishing their ostensible aims. Pope Leo X summoned a Council in the Lateran in 1512 which passed sundry useful decrees; but it made only a slight impression on the world at large, and did not serve to counteract the prevalent skepticism as to conciliar usefulness, due chiefly to the futility of the long drawn out Council of Basel.

This was the situation in the sixteenth century when the world was disturbed by the German revolt against the Church headed by Martin Luther. In his quarrel with every form of authority which opposed his various opinions, Luther habitually appealed from an authority which condemned to some other of whose support he had hopes. A General Council had its turn. At the

Diet of Augsburg, in 1530, Luther appealed for a General Council; and thereafter the matter was not allowed to drop. Negotiations lasted fifteen years. Long before they had elapsed, Luther perceived that he would certainly be condemned; whereupon he opposed the calling of a council, denounced councils and conciliar methods, and carried his case before the only tribunal he could recognize as ultimate and infallible, that of his own private judgment. Yet the history of the Council of Trent begins in 1530 with the formal appeal by Luther.

The intricacies of the political tangle prevented an immediate convocation. Protestants, who clamored for a council as long as they hoped it might support them, made frequent appeals to the Emperor, Charles V, who varied his policy to suit political conditions. He had two objects in view. He wished to reduce Germany to obedience; and this he might accomplish by making himself agent for securing the wishes of the German Protestants. He wished also "to bridle the Pope" to further designs he had for extending his rule in Italy. He wished for a council so long as he believed it might serve to further these plans. He was, says Sarpi, "ambitious to be the principal cause, himself the author and

the Pope his agent; wherefore he capitulated with the King of France to defend the old religion and to reform the court of Rome." Later, when a council seemed imminent, he interposed delays to please the German Protestants.

In response to the appeal of Luther, the Emperor Charles demanded a council of the Pope. The reigning pontiff, Clement VII, wished for no council, both from recollection that previous Councils had claimed to be superior to Popes, and because he resented the Emperor's determination to settle affairs at Rome. He did not venture openly to oppose the demand, but in every way possible put off the evil day. He never refused to summon the council, yet never did so. Clement, the second of the Medici Popes, was a man of considerable ability and great charm of manner, but insincere to a high degree and shifty in his political manœuvres. "In their verdict upon the character of Pope Clement almost all historians are agreed. He was an Italian prince, a de Medici, and a diplomat, first, and a spiritual ruler afterwards. His intelligence was of a high order, though his diplomacy was feeble and irresolute. On the other hand, his private life was free from reproach, and he had many excellent impulses: but despite good intentions, all quali-

ties of heroism and greatness must emphatically be denied him." * Clement's chief aim was to secure the papal power in Italy against imperial aggression. He never refused a request and was adroit in putting off those who made unwelcome demands. Hence, although Charles pressed his demands for six years, Clement always managed to evade them. Even in 1527, when he was at the mercy of the Emperor's soldiers who had seized and sacked Rome, he managed to postpone performance of the imperial wishes; and in 1533 he joined a league against the Emperor, headed by the King of France, with the Lutheran princes among its members. The Pope was therefore in alliance with these Protestants who acted as checks upon the Catholic Emperor. More concerned for political and Medici interests than for those of the Church, his course still further lowered the prestige of the Papacy in Europe, and gave the impression that Pope and Curia were trying to avoid practical reform. During his pontificate, the demand for a council was plainly a political move. Ostensibly it represented the ideal of those who longed for the good of the Church; actually it was part of a scheme devised by politicians, the Roman ecclesi-

* Fr. Herbert Thurston, S.J., in *Catholic Encyclopædia.*

astics being quite as secular in their ambitions as the civil sovereigns.

This preliminary manœuvring, so obviously dictated by selfishness and secularity in all concerned, did much to lower expectation of what a council, so provided, might accomplish. This first chapter of Tridentine history concerns the thrusts and dodges of three skilful and unscrupulous fencers, an astute Emperor, a shifty Pope, and an apostate monk. All of them spoke of the good of Christendom: yet it is easy to see that all were pursuing personal ends. Of the three, Charles V can best bear close scrutiny; and the one who can stand it least is Luther. It is not to be wondered that Europe, more or less aware of the moves and motives which seemed likely determine the fate of the much talked of council, should not have looked to it with any great expectation of extraordinary spiritual benefit.

The outlook brightened with the accession of Pope Paul III, who as Cardinal Farnese had acted in harmony with the emperor in urging that a council be held. He was distinctly the best Pope the sixteenth century had yet seen, no more able than Julius II, not so devout as Adrian VI, a cultured son of the Renaissance like the Medicis, Leo X and Clement VII, yet more

capable than any of them of guiding the Church to better things. He had been "practised in six popedoms," and though worldly, ambitious, and notorious for his nepotism, yet was gracious, tactful, generous, notable for his magnanimity, and never allowed his personal ambitions to conflict with the interests of the Church. The pathetic side of his domestic history has often withdrawn attention from the greatness of his public services. His pontificate was in several ways notable, but chiefly for the fact that it saw the opening of the Council of Trent. Though not by temperament a reformer, Pope Paul saw the necessity of reform; though as averse to councils as his predecessor, yet, acting from policy rather than from principle, he had always urged a council, the calling of which seemed assured by his accession in 1534. Eleven years elapsed before the actual convocation: but the delays were interposed, not by the Pope, but by the Kings of England and France and the Protestant princes of Germany.

There was difficulty in choice of a place. The Pope and Curia wished the synod to be held in one of the Italian cities; the Emperor was determined to have it in some place within his own dominions. Finally they agreed upon Trent, a

city within the limits of Germany, though near the Italian border. After several futile summons, the Council finally assembled on December 13, 1545. The Pope sought to safeguard his supremacy in the terms of convocation and gave his legates full authority to control the proceedings: he also appointed a committee of Cardinals to consider the removal of abuses at Rome, among them Cardinal Caraffa, afterward Paul IV, a vehement advocate of thoroughgoing reformation.

During the eighteen years of the Council, 1545-1563, five Popes sat, all of them committed to the reforming programme. Paul III, 1534-1550, had made this the chief feature of his policy and is preeminently the Tridentine pontiff. Julius III, 1550-1555, as Cardinal Monte, had been sent as papal legate to Trent, and continued in the path laid down by his predecessor. Marcellus II, also, as Cardinal Cervini, one of the papal legates in 1551, was a man of saintly character, wholly intent on the good of the Church. Unfortunately he only survived his elevation a few weeks. Paul IV, Caraffa, 1555-1559, a Neapolitan of intense vehemence, was almost rabid in his reforming zeal. Pius IV, 1559-1565, another of the Medici, though not at

heart a reformer and anxious only to have the Council end, was the one to whom it fell to promulgate the Tridentine decrees. The Council of Trent, therefore, was not only held under papal sanction, but throughout had papal backing, unlike the Council of Basel, to which the Popes of the day were opposed. Pius IV, who of the five was least in sympathy, and evidently nervous lest the Council should make too many changes in Rome, nevertheless declared: "We desire reform; we wish it earnestly; we would have it universal. Let what requires reform be reformed, even though it be our own person and our own affairs. If we have any other thought than to do God service, then may God visit us accordingly." That illustrates the general attitude in the middle of the sixteenth century, when the Church, from the Pope downward, was committed to the reforming programme. The Council of Trent was agent and symbol of the restorative principle in Catholicism.

In theory, the Council was in session for eighteen years. Actually there were but three periods of work, covering in all about twenty-one months. Of its twenty-five sessions, thirteen were concerned with purely formal business. The working periods were: Sessions III-VII,

February 4, 1546-March 3, 1547; Sessions XIII-XIV, October 11-November 25, 1551; and Sessions XXI-XXV, held between July 16, 1562 and December 4, 1563 with ten months of intermissions.

The number of prelates present was never large; and most of them were Italians. At the date originally set for the opening, only four of those summoned had appeared in Trent! Shortly after sixteen others joined them; but the little body could not be held together. At the actual opening in 1545, there were only twenty-five prelates, although at the close of the first period of work there were twice the number, five Cardinals and forty-eight Bishops. For the second period of work under Julius III, sixty-four were in attendance: for the closing sessions under Pius IV, the number exceeded two hundred. These numbers seem significantly insignificant. Trent seemed to fall short entirely of the standard for œcumenical councils. There had been one thousand members of the Council of Pisa, five thousand of the Council of Constance; and in the case of the latter, it is said that no fewer than one hundred thousand people were drawn to the little city at the head of the Rhine during the four years of the Council's sittings.

Although the numbers at Trent fluctuated, the Italians always outnumbered the others. There were one hundred and fifty Italians to sixty of all other nations. The decrees were ultimately signed by four Legates, two other Cardinals, three Patriarchs, twenty-five Archbishops, one hundred and sixty-eight Bishops, seven Abbots, thirty-nine proxies, and seven Generals of Religious Orders, two hundred and fifty-five in all. Of these, one hundred and eighty-nine were Italians, thirty-five Spanish, twenty-seven French, six Greeks, with no more than three representatives of any other nationality. Not one-third this number was present at any one session. The Council seemed to lack true œcumenical character; and this goes far to explain the little attention and respect it seemed to command at the time it was being held. To the world at large it seemed to differ little from such assemblies of prelates as met occasionally in Rome, at best to rank with such councils as that held in the Lateran Palace in 1512. After all the talk about it, the result was disappointing. If casual observers noted its proceedings, it was less likely to be for their bearings on reorganized Christendom, than as a fresh round in the struggle between Councils and Popes. At Pisa and Constance, the Councils

had seemed to win; at Basel, there was no doubt that the Pope had done so: how would it be at Trent? All could see that the old question was being threshed out afresh. Many paid little heed to anything else.

One of the standing problems of the later Middle Ages was of the relation of the Pope to a General Council. In the nature of things it was one which might easily cause difficulty to any student of the constitution of the Church. During the Arian troubles of the fourth century, Christendom had come to feel that the solution of difficulties was to be found in œcumenical synods: and had the question been raised during the fourth, or any of the three following, centuries, it is likely that most would have maintained that ultimate authority in the Church is vested in a Council representing the universal episcopate. The problem, however, did not take definite shape in the earlier times. The development of papal supremacy during the Middle Ages left no doubt that, had the question of ultimate authority then been raised, it would have been declared to be vested in the Pope. The Great Schism changed all this. During the fourteenth century, the necessity of appeal to some power to put an end to the scandal and anomaly of a dual papacy

caused many to recur to the old idea of the supremacy of General Councils. By the fifteenth century, this idea had become commonplace in some quarters, especially in the University of Paris, where it had exponents in the Chancellor Gerson and in Cardinal D'Ailly. As the historian Pastor comments, "the idea had a strange fascination." It was assumed by the committee of Cardinals, headed by Cardinal Cossa, afterward John XXIII, who summoned the Council of Pisa. Pisa deposed two Popes and set up a third; and the abstract question seemed to have been concretely settled. Had it needed further corroboration, it received it from Constance which deposed three Popes and set up a fourth. The world at large seemed to acquiesce in the assumption of conciliar supremacy; but not so the Popes, the Curia, and Rome. The papacy itself showed no sign of abdicating any of its traditional power. Cardinals who had been conciliar advocates at Pisa and Constance, changed their views on becoming Popes themselves, and consistently endeavored to safeguard their own supremacy against conciliar encroachment.

A great test came with the Council of Basel. There had been general demand for a new coun-

cil during the years after the dissolution of Constance; but, owing to papal opposition, none was summoned for almost twenty years. Pope Eugene IV was always hostile to the Council of Basel; and this by proving a fiasco on a large scale shook popular faith in councils, and served to offset Pisa and Constance in its bearing on the question of relative authority. This was an open question when in the sixteenth century there was demand for a new synod to deal with the Protestant revolt. The two views had partisans in the small assembly at Trent itself.

The Italians were defenders of the papacy and had been chosen to assure effective championship. The non-Italians were, almost without exception, in some degree anti-papal; some of them opposing papal prerogative in the interests of conciliar, others suspicious of papal influence in matters of practical reform. The German prelates and others under imperial influence belonged to the latter class, the Spanish and French prelates to the former. There was a difference, however, between Spanish and French, the Spanish emphasizing the ultimate authority of the universal episcopate, the French, the need of national independence in various matters and the necessity of the episcopate's being represented

by a council. The Italians had little use for either Spanish or French. As one of them wrote, "From the Spanish scab, we are fallen into the French pox." All those opposed to papal supremacy were outnumbered, outvoiced, outvoted, and outwitted by the papal partisans. The Popes were watchful in protecting their prerogatives and through their legates controlled the drift and issues of discussion. The full papal claims were expressly stated, or at least clearly implied, in every utterance or act of the Popes in dealing with the Council; they were endorsed practically by the Council whose decisions were determined by the Italian majority. The charge of "management" was freely made by those who disliked the majority decisions; but the facts show that ecclesiastical management was necessary to prevent secular management of a fatal sort!

In two ways were papal claims questioned and discussed during the council's deliberations. In the opening sessions, the French proposed the adoption of a clause, used at Pisa and Constance, describing the Council as "representing the Catholic Church." This implied the Council's supremacy. The papal legates denounced these "frothy and invidious words," but finding them

popular sent for some more Italians before additional Spaniards might arrive! There was a similar proceeding in the concluding sessions; and the "representing clause" was never adopted.

The other way was in the effort made by Spanish Bishops to urge the independence of the episcopate as established *jure Divino,* and of its right to jurisdiction over monastic orders. One of the legates in the first session told the Bishops that they "were trying to make themselves Popes in their own dioceses." There was much sound discussion of the historical development of the hierarchy, especially able speeches being made by the Archbishop of Grenada and the Bishop of Paris on the one side and by Jesuit theologians, defending the papacy as source of authority, as well as of jurisdiction, on the other. In the twenty-third session, the opinion was voiced that "Councils are above the Pope and the Bishops equal to him." The Italians opposed this and shouted down one speech defending episcopal independence; but in the closing session both opinions were declared permissible. In spite, however, of this attempt at compromise, and the policy of the Council not to condemn any opinion strongly defended in the Council itself, the conduct and consequences of the Council all

went to support the papal supremacy. No decree was passed defining this in set terms, but it was recognized by the rejection of all anti-papal proposals, by reference of all doubtful matters to the Pontiff's sole decision, and by acknowledgment that the Pope's right of interpretation of conciliar decrees, the validity of which depended on his promulgation. Papal supremacy was asserted in set terms by Paul III in the Bull of Convocation, by Julius III in his Bull of Resumption, and by Pius IV in *Benedictus Deus*, the Bull of Confirmation. On the matter of the supremacy, the mind of the Council, though expressed in no formal declaration, was perfectly clear. As a result of events in the preceding century, the relation of Pope and Council seemed before Trent to be an open question: it could scarcely be so regarded with fairness after the Council's close. This aspect of the history of the Council may well be noted by way of relating Trent to its predecessors in the conciliar line. It was much considered by ecclesiastics and the Council itself, though less noticed by the outside world than the attitude of the Council to the secular powers.*

*It is irrelevant to the present purpose to discuss the general question of the relation of General Councils to

Never was an ecclesiastical assembly subjected to more interference on the part of scheming politicians. Every sovereign in Europe was interested in its action from the standpoint of its possible bearings on his own governmental problems. Chief among them was the Emperor Charles V, who, if he could have had his own way, would have had his legates in control instead of those of the Pope. Originally the Council's sponsor, he had wished to dominate it with more paternalism than that of Constantine. He furthered or halted its progress as suited

the Pope; but it may be of use to refer to the usual mode of distinguishing papal and conciliar infallibility which are related but not identical. Conciliar decrees approved by the Pope are infallible because of the papal approbation, yet, independently of this, they may be regarded as having an infallibility of their own. To quote words of Dr. J. Wilhelm: "The Divine constitution of the Church and the promises of Divine assistance made by her Founder, guarantee her inerrancy, in matters pertaining to faith and morals, independently of the Pope's infallibility: a fallible pope supporting, or supported by, a council, would still pronounce infallible decisions. This accounts for the fact that, before the Vatican decree concerning the supreme pontiff's *ex cathedra* judgments, œcumenical councils were generally held to be infallible even by those who denied the papal infallibility; it also explains the concessions largely made to the opponents of the papal privilege that it is not necessarily implied in the infallibility of councils, and the claims that it can be proved separately

political needs, endeavored to have the German and Spanish Bishops curb and thwart Paul III with whom he had quarrelled, intervened in all discussions concerning place, and when, on account of an epidemic, the Council was transferred to Bologna, he refused to allow his subjects to attend. The assertion of episcopal independence would not have been so active, had it not had imperial instigation and backing; and owing to imperial interference the first period of work was brought to an abrupt end. Charles sought also to determine with what subjects the

and independently on its proper merits. The infallibility of the council is intrinsic, i.e., springs from its nature. Christ promised to be in the midst of two or three of His disciples gathered together in His name; now an œcumenical council is, in fact or in law, a gathering of all Christ's co-workers for the salvation of man through true faith and holy conduct; He is therefore in their midst, fulfilling His promises and leading them into the truth for which they are striving. His presence, by cementing the unity of the assembly into one body—His own mystical body—gives it the necessary completeness, and makes up for any defect possibly arising from the physical absence of a certain number of bishops. The same presence strengthens the action of the pope, so that, as mouthpiece of the council, he can say in truth 'it has seemed good to the Holy Ghost and to us,' and consequently can, and does, put the seal of infallibility on the conciliar decree irrespective of his own personal infallibility."—*Catholic Encyclopædia,* Article on General Councils.

ST. ALBERT'S COLLEGE LIBRARY

Council should deal, at first opposing all discussion of doctrinal questions whatsoever! He wished to prevent condemnation of the Protestants whom he was unwilling to aggravate; and during the discussions of Justification was acting in their interest. He wished nothing but such practical dealings with abuses as might gratify certain of his turbulent subjects. The suspension of the Council after its second period of work was owing to a situation in Trent springing out of a quarrel between Charles and Maurice of Saxony. His successor, the Emperor Ferdinand, also attempted to transfer the Council to some place farther from Rome and to stifle dogmatic discussions. He presented to the Council a reforming scheme of his own, which the fathers refused to accept.

Throughout its course the Council suffered under the incubus of imperial politics. It was prevented from meeting for long periods; its deliberations were frequently interrupted. Yet it preserved its independence. It would not place itself on ground of the Emperor's sole choosing; in spite of lay-restiveness at doctrine, it considered the whole range of Christian truth; it interpreted the Church's mind on all subjects forced into prominence by Protestant agitation.

The Emperor determined nothing when the Tridentine fathers were actually in session. Both Charles and Ferdinand on occasions sought to deal with the religious controversy in ways of their own without reference to a Council which they found it impossible to manage.

Francis I of France was mischievously active in the preliminary discussions leading to the Council; Henry II refused to allow French Bishops to attend the sessions of 1551, and later tried for a new Council in some place other than Trent. The sovereigns of England contributed only long-distance criticism. The German Protestant princes did all they could to oppose the Council, when once it appeared that the Church would attend to its own business in its own way. They sent ambassadors to the sessions of 1551, demanding that all decisions conflicting with the Lutheran Confession of Augsburg be repealed; that all debate of questions at issue between Catholics and Protestants be deferred; that the subordination of the Pope to General Councils be defined; and various other things which the Council declined to grant. After this rebuff, they were more opposed than ever, and being unable to prevent, set themselves to malign and decry the results of the Council's work.

The Council was entangled in all the meshes of secular politics; yet it afforded a consistent exhibition of the Church's power to discharge its proper functions, and vindicated the Church's independence by the persistence and dignity with which it refused to be deterred from its tasks by the bullying of secular authority. This ought to have been the impression left upon the mind of Europe; but just estimates were impossible under the political conditions of the day. Secular rulers, Catholic as well as Protestant, disapproved the independence of the fathers of Trent; and popular judgments were likely to reflect the prejudices of those in high quarters. The significance of the Council may have been apparent at Rome; but its character was little understood in the world at large. The world could see little but the politics, not only the secular, but also the ecclesiastical of which the secular politicians complained. To eyes fixed upon the warp of circumstance the pattern of the spiritual woof was not apparent.

The concrete results of the Council's action were contained in a long series of Decrees of Doctrine which were everywhere accepted by the churches in communion with the Apostolic See, and in another long series of Decrees of

Reformation which were accepted only in two countries without limitation or reservation. Yet these were to set the standard for the Church's future as well as to set the seal of approval upon its past; and in their ultimate influence is to be found the explanation of the Council of Trent's preeminent importance. These things were for the most part hidden from contemporary eyes. They saw only that the Italian majority were determined to maintain everything as traditionally established and to condemn Protestant innovations; also that they were not discriminating in their zeal of partisanship. A Dominican speaker displaying profound knowledge in discussion of an unpopular subject was given scant hearing; others talking arrant nonsense in support of a favored topic were received with rapturous applause! There was much that was cut and dried in the modes of procedure, not a little that was ludicrous in the turn of events.

At the Council's close, one of the leading figures was the French Cardinal Lorraine. He had been expected to head the opposition in efforts to minimize papal authority; but he himself aspired to the papal tiara, and had been given to understand that Pius IV, then seriously ill, regarded him as probable successor. He knew that the

Pope wished the Council to end at once without any action prejudicial to papal prerogative. Lorraine felt that the Pope's interests were his own; and when word came that Pius was not likely to live, he hurried the Council to its conclusion before news of the expected death could reach Trent. The closing exercises were rushed through; plenary indulgence was promised to all who had assisted; a programme of carefully arranged acclamations was effectively rendered. Lorraine himself led the Bishops in the shouting, "Long life to His Holiness, the Pope"—whom he even then believed to be dead, and whose place he aspired to fill—"Long life to the Emperor!" To the displeasure of the French Bishops he started no cheer for his own King.

The close of the Council brought great relief to the Pope, who speedily recovered his health, appointed nineteen of his staunchest supporters in the Council to the Sacred College, and relapsed into somewhat worldly ways. In Germany neither Catholics nor Protestants were pleased; in France the Council was ridiculed; the King of Spain accepted such things as he liked; in Portugal and Poland alone were its decisions received entire: upon those who had revolted from the Church the Council seemed to have no effect at

all. To superficial observation it seemed to indicate that the Church could no longer exert such power as had been hers in the past: so it seemed to many for a long time to come.

Historic perspective, however, shows it in unique eminence as the most important event in the sixteenth century. The political systems of which it seemed to be an inconspicuous part have altered beyond recognition or vanished; no political institution of the Tridentine period survives in unchanged identity; old names live, but with new meanings. The religious excitements in the midst of which it appeared have almost burned themselves out. Of all that existed in Europe of the middle sixteenth century only those things remain unchanged for which the name of Trent is synonym. That these things so stand, and will stand for all time to come, is due under providence of Almighty God to the results of the deliberations of those ecclesiastics gathered in the Cathedral of the little Tyrolese city encircled by Dolomite crags. What has been said is mere sketching on the surface of things: later must be considered what lies beneath and beyond.

II

THE PROTESTANT REFORMATION

II

The Protestant Reformation

The Council of Trent can only be rightly estimated by clear understanding of the nature of the crisis it was called to face. Ever since the thirteenth century, there had been demands for reform in the Church, and attempts to mend matters, which aimed, not at altering doctrine, but at restoring discipline. They had to do with regulation of the lives of clergy and religious, and with the administration of the Roman Curia in matters of appointments and use of moneys. There was no quarrel with the existence and theory of the hierarchy, but a general restiveness at its worldliness, a suspicion that there was too much luxury and too much politics at headquarters. The saints of the Church were all praying for "reform in head and members." The idea of reformation was no invention of the sixteenth century. What was accomplished at the Council of Trent represented the culmination of the aspirations and efforts of centuries.

The name "Reformation," however, commonly signifies everything in the religious changes of

the sixteenth century except what had to do with Trent. The Tridentine alterations are considered to belong to what is called the "Counter-reformation." "Reformation" is used to signify the triumph of Protestant purity over Catholic corruption. This must be regarded as misuse of a good old name by all who believe in the continuity of the Catholic Church. What is called "the Reformation" signifies not correction of the Church, but its disintegration, a revolt from authority which has often threatened to end in the ruin of religion. It stands for a tendency to pare away the outer protections of historic Christianity, which, by three centuries' experience, has been shown to lead away from Christianity altogether.

Catholicism represents the ordered progress of historic Christianity, the evolution of revealed truth and sacramental life: Eastern Orthodoxy represents this development arrested at the eighth century: Protestantism is a definite turning back, its varieties being merely different degrees of retrogression. It has always aimed at minimizing the supernatural; its "progress," therefore, is in the opposite direction from that of Catholicism. In spite of the sincerity and earnestness of most who have cherished it as Christianity in pristine

purity, it has always exhibited a tendency to reduce revelation to lowest terms, to revert from higher stages of development to lower, somewhat as certain people assume that man must renounce, or ignore, the crowning characteristics of human nature out of deference to ancestral monkeys and jelly-fishes from whom they believe themselves to be evolved! Thus must it be regarded by those who hold to the realities of Revelation and the Church. Among adherents of Protestantism have always been those who deplored these tendencies, yet failed to see that they are organic and fatal. Revivals like "the Oxford Movement" have represented efforts of Protestants to turn around and crawl back a limited portion of historic Christianity's abandoned path, along which all the time the Catholic Church has been steadily advancing.

The sixteenth century saw reform in the Church, affected chiefly by the instrumentalities in evidence at the Council of Trent. It also saw much "reformation" which represented revolt and cutting loose from the Church altogether. In dealing with the history of this period, it is especially necessary to look behind names at things; and one of the terms needing closest scrutiny is "reformation." What was reformed,

and how, and why? Did change make things better or worse? Things moved certainly; but in what direction?

In the Protestant Reformation there were three chief lines of defection from the Church, Saxon, Swiss and English. All of them claimed to preserve Christian continuity; yet all were efforts to start afresh after a vital breach with the Christian past. In occasions and accidents the three were independent; yet all could be traced to similar causes in a time of upheaval and readjustment in European life; and lapse of time has revealed their common character by the similarity of their practical results. They are not unrelated to the historical context, yet differ radically from the movements in the Church to which nominally they are allied. Reference has already been made to the sequence of events which connects Boniface VIII with Luther. These link the mediæval papacy at its height with Protestantism. Boniface's quarrel with France led to the papal exile in Avignon; the exile led to the Great Schism; this to the demand for reform; this to the reforming councils; the failure of these to the tolerance of radical suggestion; and then came Luther, only too radical and too ready to suggest. He was one of many who used "re-

form of the Church" as stalking-horse for schemes of progressive destruction. "Abuses" were too often mere pretexts for abuse, the malignant symptoms of someone's *cacoëthes vituperandi.*

1. Luther inaugurated a revolution which shattered the external fabric of Christianity and lost much of its inner spirit. Beginning with an attack on the use of indulgences, he was led to defy the authority of the Church, represented in the Pope, who was ready to condemn him; and from the Church he appealed to the authority of Holy Scripture. Confronted with different interpretations of Scripture, he refused to defer to any but his own; and thus in self-defence was led to enounce his doctrine of private judgment. By defiance of authority, he was led to extremes of self-assertion; and his influence has been shown more by the habit of individual choice of a creed without reference to authority than by perpetuation of his own opinions.

After several years of controversy, he broke completely from the Church, gained a following in Saxony, Hesse, and other German States, being finally recognized as ecclesiastical dictator by several German princes, in whose domains he introduced a system of his own in place of the existing

Catholicism. He adopted a German Mass, in which the Real Presence was recognized, but from which all trace of the Eucharistic Sacrifice had been eliminated. He administered Communion in both kinds, but did away with the historic priesthood. He translated the Bible into German and gave the people plenty of hymns. He proclaimed a series of dogmas centring about Justification by Faith, of which the classic declaration was the Confession of Augsburg. But the practices he introduced, the doctrines he denounced or distorted, counted for less than the tendency of the movement he inaugurated. Very few still hold Luther's opinions; millions are still handicapped by inheritance of the Lutheran tendency.

Luther was the personification of individual arrogance. He quarrelled with the Pope because he himself wished to be regarded as supreme in Germany. Against the infallibility of the successor of St. Peter, and for that matter of Scripture, he set up his own. If other private judgments conflicted with his, he anathematized them. "I am the man," he declared, "to whom God has revealed His Word. Martin Luther is the first man in the Reformation: he therefore should command, you should obey: it is your lot. . . .

I will defend my opinions against all the world. What comes from my lips is not anger of mine, but God's. . . . I have the Gospel not from man, but from heaven through Jesus Christ." Clement VII and Paul III never talked like that! He rebelled against every authority which would have curbed his individual will, and in every particular outdid the authorities whom he defied. The fashion of defiance he set was followed by others in the overthrow of those parts of Christian truth which he had left alone. Protestantism is not a body of opinions, but a habit, a habit of rejection, usually indicative of skittishness at the supernatural.

The basic motives of Luther's action seem to have been the arrogance of self-assertion and hatred of the Church's rule of celibacy on the part of one who found continence difficult. Along with these were an enthusiasm for instruction of the people, which can be commended, and a patriotism which, in part at least, was but the expression of individual vanity. "I was born," he said, "for the good of my dear Germans; and I will never cease to serve them. . . . We are all jolly good fellows, we Germans; we eat and drink and sing, and break our glasses and lose at one sitting one hundred or a thousand florins. . . .

The German language is superior to all others, and the German people are more honest, right, and true, than all others." This appeal to racial self-complacency goes far to explain his popularity, and illustrates that sense of nationality which at this time was disintegrating both imperial feudalism and Catholic unity. Luther, as German, was suspicious of everything Italian, and, partly on racial grounds, opposed the Roman Curia and defended heresy and schism, both because his own and because "made in Germany."

Luther must be judged by the ultimate consequences of his influence. The actual changes made by the German princes during his life, whereby Lutheranism became the religion of most of Germany, count for little as compared with the subsequent drift from all moorings which may be traced to the Lutheran fashion of wilfulness. The evangelical aspects of Luther's teaching became less and less apparent. "Justification by Faith" was translated by revivalists into justification by fits: this led inevitably to justification by mere fits and starts, and eventually to justication of little or no faith at all. What has lived on is the Lutheran rationalizing, a tendency to unbelief which has found its strongest bulwarks among German non-

Catholics. In dealing with the questions raised by Luther, the Church had not only to consider the degree of technical orthodoxy in the Confession of Augsburg, but the attitude and drift which was to make Lutheran lands the homes of materialistic paganism.

2. Independent of Luther and the Germans was the revolt from the Church in Switzerland which found leaders in Zwingli of Zurich, and Calvin of Geneva. The Swiss "Reform" was more purely intellectual than Lutheranism. Luther represented the waywardness of uncontrolled passion and ambition, Calvin the logical tyrannies of a cold-blooded legalist. The latter, following Zwingli, endeavored, at the age of twenty-seven, to devise a Scriptural Christianity which should supersede the Church. In seeking to use Scripture as a legal code, he naturally found more to his purpose in the prescriptions of Moses than in the theology of St. Paul and St. John. The Old Testament atmosphere was more congenial than that of the New; and in many ways Calvin's system represents reversion from Christianity to Judaism. It has close parallels with Mohammedanism. Calvin's influence was due in no small degree to the convenience of his *Institutes* as a text-book, which many took as

substitute for the theology and canon law of the Schoolmen and for less coherent doctrinal schemes put forth by other reformers.

Calvin's theology is based on the principle that God is Power. The Almighty, Whose Will can not be resisted, is the Cause of all that exists, of evil as well as of good. Everything has been settled by Divine decree from all eternity; predestination is the one important fact. Man can do nothing to determine his own destiny; he can only arrive at conviction as to whether he has been elected to bliss or doomed to hell. Calvinist preaching was the utterance of those who believed themselves irresistibly elect, denouncing all opposed to them as irresistibly damned. The thought of the love of God was practically ignored.

In Geneva Calvin devised a system of government intended as a model for the world. His rule was one of strict severity. "From the cradle to the grave, the Genevan citizen was pursued by an inquisitorial eye." Every detail of life was prescribed; and deviation from the rules was punished with severity. Amusements of all sorts were considered wicked, beauty in every form a snare of the devil. Churches were bare and ugly since severity was the mark of true religion.

Calvin, claiming to rule in God's Name, was intolerant of disobedience or dispute of his authority, and was ready to burn for heresy. The Popes and Inquisition were mild by comparison!

It is hard to understand how men should have submitted to some of the tyrannies, or, with Bibles before them, have acquiesced in so distorted a presentation of Christian truth. But for three centuries many did, chiefly in Switzerland and Scotland, also in France, Holland, England and America. The revolt of many from "orthodoxy" is revolt from Calvinism; and much of the present indifference to religion in this country is due to reaction from Puritanism on the part of those to whom the doctrine of the Incarnation and the Church has never been fairly presented. Yet the stern school of Geneva taught useful lessons and developed certain aspects of strong character. It taught the fear of God, which is the beginning of wisdom, stimulated wills, enforced obedience, and inculcated sense of duty. Discipline by disagreeables gave strength, though not loveliness, of character, and encouraged tough virtues, though showing small regard for tender ones.

The first Calvinists were self-centred and selfish; but their descendants improved on them.

These were never half as bad as the ferocities of their theology might have made them. Pugnacity for their own rights led to consideration of the rights of others resulting in much philanthropical activity. It is natural for men of this stamp to recognize no authority except one identified with their own interests. Hence Calvinism has always favored democracy, which for both good and ill owes much to it. Its influence has been one-sided and has provoked mischievous reactions; yet its strength is exhibited in the modern political systems under which many of us live and flourish, which owe much of their stability to Puritan elements in their foundations. No one who values these institutions can fail to acknowledge good results of Calvinist influence; nor can one who scrutinizes their consequences fail to deplore many of them. He must condemn the system while approving many trained by it. The explanation is simple. The strength of every partial presentation of Christianity rests on the elements of Catholic completeness which it retains; its weakness is due to tampering with this by theological quacks. Most heresy is partial truth in isolation, orthodoxy out of focus. God *is* Power, as Calvin taught, but not Power *only*, as he practically assumed: man *is* justified by

faith, as Luther had been taught as a Catholic, not by faith *only*, which was his Protestant specialty. Protestantism at its best is diminished Catholicity; and the diminutions are of infinite degrees. Calvinist influence is largely responsible for the habit of Scripture study, which has trained generations of God-fearing men and women; yet its exaltation of the Bible has led many to think of Christianity as religion of a Book, rather than as the religion of Christ, and sometimes to set up the Bible as "an idol" by making it practical substitute for the Personal God. It is significant of the inner tendencies of things that to-day it is among Protestants that the authority of the Bible is sinking into disuse and discredit, and that the only place where it is now habitually preached is the Catholic Church.

3. Distinct from Saxon Protestantism and Swiss Reform was the separation of the Church of England from Catholic unity. King Henry VIII of England, wishing to repudiate his wife that he might marry another, sought from Pope Clement VII a declaration of the nullity of his marriage, which the Pope did not actually refuse, but delayed to grant. In his impatience, Henry took up a suggestion made by an ecclesiastical

lawyer, Thomas Cranmer, that questions of marriage could be settled in the English courts without reference to Rome. Cranmer was made Archbishop of Canterbury, held a court which gave sentence as the King wished, and married Henry to the woman of his choice. The Queen of England appealed to the Pope, who finally declared her marriage lawful, denouncing Henry's second marriage and the tribunal which had authorized it.

The breach between Pope and King was final. Thenceforth, Henry encouraged all opposition to the papacy, yet made few changes in the Church except such as were involved in a brutal suppression of the English monasteries, whose property he appropriated. The chief significance of this royal tyranny, making use of prevalent unrest, is to be seen in the assumption of national and provincial independence in certain matters ecclesiastical, and in the encouragement of the critical side of the New Learning. Renaissance criticism had corrected many errors in ecclesiastical tradition, and established precedents of historical accuracy which have guided Catholic scholarship in modern times. Yet it did not in correction of details upset ecclesiastical foundations. It was assumed, however, in England and

elsewhere, that criticism had shown the papacy to be not essential to the Church as Divinely established, but as a political accident of the Middle Ages which represented an encroachment on the lawful authority of civil rulers and the episcopate. Henry encouraged this criticism. It was his way of getting even with a Pope who would not assist in his matrimonial ventures, of arrogating papal authority to himself, and of justifying his campaign of plunder. He did not, however, wish to touch the Church's doctrines; and only a few in England were during his reign affected by the Protestantism of the Continent. After his death disruption went further.

His successor, the boy-king Edward VI, was controlled by men hostile to the Church. During the six years of his reign, England was ruled by a Privy Council, headed first by the Duke of Somerset, Edward's uncle, and then by the Duke of Northumberland, both of them intent on plunder. What Henry had done to the monasteries, they wished to do to the Universities and all the churches. The Protestant outcry against "idolatry" and "superstition" in the Mass gave them the excuse they wished, the helplessness of the boy-king, their opportunity. They let loose a herd of imported agitators, who afforded

pretext for their spoliations by violent denunciation of the Mass and the Priesthood. Cranmer, habitually subservient to those in authority and disposed to favor the Continental views, composed a Prayer Book and an Ordinal, which, although preserving many features of the Latin formularies, translated into matchless English, accomplished the purpose of the Privy Council by abolishing Mass and Priesthood together. The English Communion Office was carefully rid of any trace of the Eucharistic Sacrifice; the new Ordinal set apart ministers who were plainly distinguished from sacrificing Priests. At the time it was well understood that Mass and Priesthood had been abolished. Over two centuries later, there were Anglican theologians who contended that the essentials of both had been retained; and this is the belief of many devout Anglicans to-day. Yet their Prayer Book will not stand Catholic tests; even where language is used which of itself would seem to safeguard Catholic doctrine, there is a context of history and use which shows that it can not be taken at face-value. Catholic names have been retained with Protestant signification. The use of the Prayer Book was imposed by royal authority; and the superseding of the Catholic Sacraments and Liturgy by the maimed

English rites was the justification alleged for plunder of the churches built by Catholics for Catholic worship.

The work of Edward's reign was apparently undone in the reign of his sister Queen Mary. Communion with the Apostolic See was restored; the new ministry and English services were relagated to obscurity; the Catholic Priesthood and Sacraments were reinstated. This was done with the approval of the great majority of the English people. But the methods employed by those in authority were not popular; the burning of heretics at Smithfield caused revulsion of feeling: and when Mary was succeeded by Elizabeth, who, for personal and political reasons, sought non-Catholic allies, the new Queen was able, with the acquiescence if not full consent of most of her subjects, to revert to the state of things established under her brother Edward.

In all that was done in England, there was always maintained the legal fiction of the continuity of the English Church and its hierarchy. Yet analysis of the facts shows that in England, no less than in Germany and Switzerland, there was a break with the Catholic past, due largely to the assumption that national churches were self-sufficient, and that antiquarian discovery might

be alleged to excuse fresh starts. The English reformers sought patristic, as well as Scriptural, authority in support of their contentions; and avoided the radical extremes of Continental Protestantism: yet English Protestantism like the other forms represents a deliberate drawing back from the full consequences of the Catholic Faith, nor have there ever been in England more than a very few Churchmen who were ready to accept the whole teaching of those early fathers whose authority they exalted. All who revolted from the Church drew lines which separated from the Catholic Faith and Catholic unity. The lines were drawn variously. In England they were less remote from the Catholic norm than elsewhere. Yet the lines drawn marked off the English Establishment from the Catholic Church and connected it with the congeries of Continental sects.

There have always been varieties of opinion among Anglicans, and toleration of varied, even opposing, views, some approximating the extremes of Protestant radicalism, others but little differentiated from Catholic orthodoxy, with all sorts in between. By force of circumstances Anglicans are forced to countenance various heresies, though probably not themselves holding

them, and to be parties to the perpetuation of heresy. They are also schismatical, though it be as hereditary victims of unscrupulous rulers in the past, and are all of them committed to the principle, as well as to a condition, of schism. In spite of the contention of many of the best Anglicans that theirs is a "Catholic Communion," a "branch" of the Catholic Church, facts are stubborn things. The present trend of events in the Anglican Churches, whereby they are becoming more closely associated with other Protestant bodies, represents a law of spiritual gravitation whereby they are finding their proper level. Anglicanism is more decorous than many forms of Protestantism; yet differences in its outward forms cannot disguise its identity in inner spirit.

4. In the case of all the leading reformers, it is possible to point to personal and political considerations which occasioned the individual rebellion. Nevertheless the occurrence of similar phenomena in different places shows that all must be traced to a general cause. This is to be found in the unrest that pervaded Europe in a time of upheaval and readjustment. The attacks on the Church had common characters. There were differences in the objections made, and in the

ST. ALBERT'S COLLEGE LIBRARY

degrees of emphasis given to them: but in the last analysis they may be seen to be akin. At the base of the various attacks, no matter how much associated with aims of a different sort, may usually be detected one, or all, of three things: restiveness at spiritual authority, restiveness at the demands of asceticism, restiveness at the supernatural, that is, a tendency to a spirit of anarchy, to the habit of self-indulgence, and to the philosophy of materialism.

There was rebellion against authority as such. To begin with, it was revolt of the laity against the clergy on the assumption that none had right to exercise authority over another in spiritual things; and this in spite of the fact that the overthrow of constituted authority resulted in setting up some intolerable tyranny. As often happens, the removal of legitimate authority was destructive of freedom. "Priestcraft" was milder than preachercraft; and both of them trifles compared to kingcraft. Luther, Calvin and Henry VIII were in their respective ways more intolerably tyrannical than Popes and Curia. And they were all founders of tyrannical dynasties. Lay-usurpation in matters of religion proved a terrible evil in its first exhibitions, and futile for its ostensible purposes in its milder and later forms.

Moreover the derangements in the Church were but one aspect of the revolt against authority which has characterized the modern era. The issue of the Reformation agitation is to be seen in the modern uprisings against every form of rule, in so-called Socialism which is sheer individualism, and in so-called democracy which is often nothing but anarchy. These effects were not foreseen nor intended by those responsible for starting the train of events which led to them. They belong to the inevitable struggle whereby the world is having to work out the relations between law and freedom.

There was also a common hatred of asceticism, a revolt of human passions against the Church's strict control. Henry VIII and Luther found many to back them in their war on monks. Instances of monastic corruption there undoubtedly were; but the clamor against corruption was mere pretext for pillage. Greed for monastic wealth was the determining cause of most attacks: but there was also root-hatred of the ascetic principle. The standards of the religious life, as of the celibate clergy, were a rebuke to an ease-loving people. In an age keen for physical well being, no matter how some might disparage the beauty of the world, there was hatred of a discipline

which conflicted with "the gospel of solid comfort." Protestantism always explained away the evangelical counsels.

There was, in the third place, a restiveness at the supernatural. Reformers might begin with denouncing indulgences or something else; they invariably ended by assailing the Priesthood and the Mass. It was always the Mass that mattered, and always the Mass that was marred. The Mass was a miracle, and as such rejected. Modes and degrees of rejection might vary: but in some way or other there was charge of "superstition," by which was meant practical recognition of the supernatural. Not that this was ever denied in set terms: merely that it had to be relegated to a safe distance. In Palestine of the first century and in Egypt two thousand years before Christ, it was tolerable, but not on the altars of Swiss and English parish-churches. It was only possible to believe in God, if He kept His distance. The minimizing of the supernatural in the early stages has led to complete denial of the miraculous in many of the later. The campaign against the Mass as guarantee of God's perpetual presence led on to denials of the Incarnation, the ultimate goal of the process being atheism. The overthrow of Sacraments in the sixteenth cen-

tury led to overthrow of Creeds in the eighteenth; and both happened for the reason that self-sufficient man had ceased to feel the need of Divine grace and Divine truth. In some cases repudiation of grace and truth in action has been carried to denial of them in their source. God is useless as an absentee, and meaningless as an abstraction. If infinitely removed from human life, there is little or no need of keeping up profession of belief in Him. Agnosticism is consistent with its antecedents. This is the natural term of a movement of thought which transfers the centre of things from God to man's interior, and, instead of deriving truth from God's intimations, fabricates a substitute in the individual imagination. It overthrows the authority of revelation for the sake of exalting human guess-work. That in the last resort was the issue raised by the Protestant revolt.

There has been no permanent perpetuation of Protestantism in its original forms. Where the letter of these is preserved, the spirit is lacking. No one now reproduces the opinions of Luther or Calvin or Henry VIII. Yet the movement of which they were symptoms, rather than causes, lives on in the form of a drift away from the

definite in religion. Private judgment "lives its own life" and "serves God in its own way," producing bizarre bits of cubist impressionism. And when private judgments, each a law to itself and creator of its own category, compare notes, they discover the infinite "varieties of religious experience," and quite naturally privately judge that it is all rather meaningless. Indifference as to matters religious is the natural consequence of individualism. It is not strange that in some places where this drift has been strong Christianity has become a dead letter: the surprising thing is how much Christianity survives where there has been apparent abandonment of its ancient foundations. The logical goal of certain common presuppositions is atheism; but few carry the presuppositions to their goal. Instead we find good-natured, public-spirited people whose good nature and public spirit are obvious consequences of Christian elements in their education. No one who knows them can be blind to the existence on all sides of goodness of the type normally produced by a firm faith. It is probably to be ascribed to "the faith that lives in honest doubt." Sober study of the conditions in the world to-day will nevertheless intensify

conviction that it is through "believing" that we "have life in His Name."

The consistent Protestants are the Unitarians. They have no creed except the dogma of undogmatism, and a certain amount of talk about "the Fatherhood of God and brotherhood of man," which may mean much, or little, or nothing. The Unitarian may believe or not believe anything he pleases. Only he must not consider his beliefs or disbeliefs matters of importance or insist on anyone's sharing them. There is nothing in the Unitarian position to prevent him from believing in the Trinity and seven Sacraments, if he chooses—except that he would suffer from lonesomeness! This Unitarian attitude follows from the assumption that all Protestants make, namely, that religion is purely a matter of personal preference. In these days of frantic efforts to "get together" in mists of amiable vagueness, it should be recognized that the Unitarians have been the pioneers who have blazed the inevitable path by removing all traces of landmarks! They have been most clear-headed of all in seeing what their premises involve. Utter vagueness of belief as the result of an inherent skepticism is the natural outcome of the movement inaugurated by Luther.

"Faith only" headed in the direction of no faith at all—that was the issue raised in the sixteenth century, in regard to which the Council of Trent had to express the Church's mind for the time and the times to come.

III

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF TRENT

III

The Significance of Trent

In sketching the history of the Council of Trent, effort has been made to indicate why to contemporary eyes it did not seem to have extraordinary significance, and in sketching the chief phases of Protestantism to point that the religious revolt had consequences not foreseen or wished by those responsible for its beginnings. It is the purpose of this paper to show how, in face of what threatened to undermine the Faith, the Tridentine Council showed the indestructibility of the Faith by exhibiting its permanence through the Church.

The secular authorities wished the Council to demonstrate its usefulness in tranquillizing their turbulent subjects. The Roman hierarchy, however, wished it to define the faith in face of error and to enforce discipline in face of laxity. There was no notion in Rome of convening the Church's doctors and pastors merely to have them perform functions of police! The situation appeared in nutshell in the imperial demands that discussions of doctrine be avoided, or at least

postponed, and in the papal refusals to grant them. The action of the Council was a declaration of the Church's independence and vindication of her right to freedom from secular interference. The Italian majority assured not only protection of papal interests, but also action which could be regarded as worthy of the Church. Yet over a century elapsed before the Church as a whole began to wake to the Council's unique significance; and the World has not done so yet.

It has been called a "turning-point in Church History." It was, on the contrary, a point at which the Church did *not* turn. It has also been described as a stopping-place, as if the Church had balked in her ancient ways and refused to budge. On the contrary, it was a place at which the Church did *not* stop but inaugurated a fresh advance. It was rather a great sign erected at cross-roads indicating the straight road along which the Church had been proceeding ever since Pentecost, and along which she proposed to proceed until the Day of Judgment. It indicated her intention to avoid all the possible detours afforded by the mazes of sixteenth century commotion, and her determination not to compromise her principles or to change her proper direction.

An oft-quoted *dictum* of an Anglican writer declares that Trent "stereotyped all that was most Roman and least Catholic." By this is chiefly signified that it gave the stamp of authoritative approval to what was scholastic as distinct from what was patristic, to what was mediæval as distinct from what was primitive. That is only to say that it recognized the continuity of the Church through the ages, and in effective action gave convincing demonstration that the Living Church is ever acting for the Living Christ, instead of being an academical abstraction, differently abstracted by divers students of ancient archives. Representing the Church, it refused to repudiate the past, and gave the world evidence of its confidence in facing the future. For purposes of the present generalizations, its significance may be considered under five heads, Reform, Education, Doctrine, Government and the Church.

1. "The Reformation" commonly signifies the train of events whereby there was a recasting of much that pertains to the life of the Church in ways immediately disastrous and ultimately fatal. There was, however, a genuine reform of abuses in which the Council of Trent was the effective instrument. It was called primarily to be a re-

forming council; and as a reforming council it discharged important functions.

The programme of practical measures, whereby the Church was recalled to its proper standards, was comprised in one hundred and fifty-four Decrees of Reformation. These aimed at securing, and eventually did secure, the selection of fit men for the priesthood and their efficient discharge of their duties. They forbade (with reservations) Non-residence of Pastors, Pluralities, abuses of Patronage and Dispensations, and Simony. They enjoined Episcopal Visitations, strictness in admitting to Orders, Discipline of the Clergy, care for Preaching, Teaching and Pastoral Visiting, fair ecclesiastical Trials, holding of Synods, careful management of Church-Property. They sternly condemned clerical immoralities and luxury and sought to prevent possibility of them as well as breaches of monastic rules. A few decrees concerned the laity, viz. absolute prohibition of remarriage after divorce, of duelling, and of interference by secular princes with the rights of the Church. They sought also to remove anything tending to "covetousness, irreverence and superstition" in the use of Sacraments.

These decrees established nothing new. They

merely confirmed traditional standards of discipline and provided guarantees for their observance. They did, however, deal with all aspects of prevalent laxity and showed the readiness of the Church to correct what was amiss in her system, although refusing to acquiesce in its destruction. At the time it seemed to many conceivable that the Church as a whole might follow the lead of Germany and England in superseding an ascetic clergy by a clergy very domestic, giving up the evangelical counsels as impossible requirements. Trent nailed the evangelical counsels to the Church's mast. There was hue and cry for "purity" in the Church. "Very well," said Trent, "we will hold to the highest standards of purity as exalted in the ages of faith." "There never were any good old times," objected the Protestants. "Very well," said Trent, "let us make the new ones better." Reform was revival, exhibition of the Church's perpetual powers of resuscitation. It was not necessary to devise new discipline, merely to amend laxities in enforcment. The Church's established system must be given new lease of life. Acceptance of this practical programme was only gradual. It did, however, set the pace for the future. There had been scandals, due to the self-seeking and self-

indulgence of many in authority. Trent undertook to make their recurrence impossible. It could never afterward be said that the Church by connivance made herself party to the delinquencies of unworthy sons. Thenceforward was advance on a higher plane.

The Tridentine reforms were something more than a scheme on paper. They were at once translated into action by some of the greatest Churchmen of the day. For example, their spirit is excellently illustrated in such lives as those of St. Philip Neri and St. Charles Borromeo. The latter may well be regarded as the personification of Tridentine reform. His connection with the Council was intimate. He was the nephew of Pope Pius IV, who appointed him papal Secretary of State: and to his activity chiefly was due the reassembling of the Council in 1562 for its closing sessions. The difficulties seemed insuperable. The Emperor, the King of Spain and the King of France were all opposed; there was reluctance on the part of some high ecclesiastics: that the opposition was overcome was the direct result of Cardinal Borromeo's patience, tact and persistence. The satisfactory conclusion of the Council's work was to be attributed to him more perhaps than to any other one person. More-

over he set an excellent example of the Tridentine ideals in the regulation of his own life as Cardinal and in his administration of the archdiocese of Milan. His last twenty years were spent in consistent efforts to carry out the Tridentine programme. Among his special tasks were the drawing up of the Catechism in which the doctrine of Trent was concisely stated, assistance in the work of revision of the Missal and Breviary and in the improvement of church-music. He was preeminently the example of one "glorious in pastoral solicitude." His clergy, the religious Orders, the children, the poor, were all equally objects of his care and affection. He urged his clergy to take the lead in carrying into effect the godly discipline enjoined by the Church. "We ought to walk in front, that our spiritual subjects may follow more easily." He displayed unsparing devotion in the work of preaching, teaching, pastoral visiting, provision for the poor, and tending the victims of the plague, thus illustrating his ideals of spiritual leadership. The sixteenth century produced no greater saint. He had a worthy successor in his cousin, Federico Borromeo, a man of dignity, gentleness and charity, whose heroic leadership of his clergy, of whom ninety-five gave their lives, in time of

pestilence and famine, has been depicted in Manzoni's *I Promessi Sposi.* It was he who founded the Ambrosian Library, a famous home of learning and school of arts, and who was himself a voluminous author as well as pastor of the type of St. Charles. Men like these, like St. Philip and his Oratorians, like Pope St. Pius V, are reformers indeed whom the Catholic Church holds up as practical refutation of the pretensions of such self-proclaimed "reformers" as Cranmer, Calvin and Luther.

2. Reform is closely connected with Education. Trent has important bearings on this also. The Revival of Learning had aroused interest in antiquity, first in pagan literature, philosophy and art, later in Christian literature and history. The Renaissance criticism disposed of many fictions of mediæval mythology. Discoveries as to the extent of the world, and wider diffusion of knowledge by the invention of printing, made the sixteenth century a time of many new ideas and helped the readjustment of trained minds to more accurate views of many things. Yet not all who made pretensions to enlightenment were able to attain it. The Protestants were disposed to consider themselves its apostles; and their influence was used to further popular education. Yet they

overthrew more than they set up of schools and libraries; and their claim to a monopoly of "scholarship" has never yet been justified by facts.

Of all those whom they acclaimed as leaders, the most learned was Desiderius Erasmus, "the Doctor of Europe." Erasmus was the determined foe of ignorance and superstition. His edition of the New Testament, his satires upon the ignorance of clergy and monks, his correction of historical errors, was a striking example of intelligent criticism of misconceptions and misfortunes common in his time. His invectives against evils were widely used by Protestants who wished to think that "Erasmus laid the egg that Luther hatched." Yet Erasmus lived and died a Catholic. Nothing would induce him to throw in his lot with Luther or Calvin; and such learning and criticism as his belong not to Protestantism but to the Church. Erasmus opposed himself to many in authority; yet he represents something within the Church, not out of it, and was only the most conspicuous of the intellectuals in the Church, many of whom surpassed him in spiritual devotion.

There were many in his category, eager to correct misconceptions in detail as to matters

affecting the Church, yet opposed to those who, under pretext of "New Learning," were obvious foes of Old Truth. These men were ready to appropriate what was sound in Renaissance criticism, but would not be parties to heresy and destruction. Trent illustrates this. Among its doctors were representatives of the best learning of the time; and one of its incidental aspects is its illustrations of the Catholic instinct of appropriation of what in criticism is sound. It showed that the Church has place for all seekers after truth, and for all partial truths, so long as there is unflinching loyalty to the Truth Incarnate, and to the Church as "pillar and ground of the Truth." The devout studies of the Church's children, even if imperfect, were not banned along with the errors of the Church's foes. The Church's concern was, and is, that what is labelled "learning" should deserve the title. There has always been much spurious "scholarship" against which the Church has to guard. Hence the necessity of an Index. Truth is only free when Error is kept under guard.

Trent furnished precedents for the activities of modern Catholic scholarship, illustrated in the next generation by the work of such men as Cardinals Bellarmine and Baronius, and then and

later on by the work done in revision of the Breviary. In the Council itself its ideals were disclosed in the character of its leading theologians. None were more distinguished than the Jesuit doctors, James Lainez and Alphonsus Salmeron. Salmeron ranks with Erasmus as a profound student of Scripture; and his commentaries take high place in the history of New Testament exegesis. He was a great preacher, a fact which may account for the practical character of his expositions. His influence was felt throughout the deliberations at Trent, and not least in the discussions of the doctrine of Justification, in which Lainez also took a prominent part. So evident was the superiority of the two Jesuits that Cardinal Cervini, as presiding legate during the second period, arranged that Salmeron should open, and Lainez close, all the debates. Paul III was deeply impressed by their theological acumen; and their writings were distributed to the Bishops of the Council.

It was Lainez who unerringly detected the inner character and tendency of the Protestant teaching, and whose exact language was used in a number of the more important definitions, notably those of Penance, the Sacrifice of the Mass, and the Sacrament of Orders. He was allowed

the unusual privilege of making three-hour addresses, and was described by his colleague as "one of the Council's eyes." For nine months there were discussions of the relation of the episcopate to the papacy. Lainez stood out firmly for the Divine origin of the episcopal authority, as also for the papacy as source of episcopal jurisdiction. Papal supremacy found in the Council no more strenuous defender. Although the Council put forth no definition of this, the defence of it as contained in Lainez' *Disputationes Tridentinæ* held possession of the field. Lainez is preeminently the theologian of Trent and may well be taken as representative of the Catholic learning of the time. His balanced and perfectly correlated statements of doctrine are conspicuously superior to the most elaborate expositions of the Protestant reformers, whose theology is evidently out of focus. From the standpoint of the central truth of the Incarnation, alive to every reflection of this in the manifold life of the Church, he gives comprehensive surveys of the truth in all its richness and complexity, observing "the proportion of faith," since, instead of indulging in individual speculation, he sets out to express the corporate mind of the Church. He is a capital example of

catholicity in intellect and knowledge, altogether worthy to act as effective exponent of the doctrine of St. Thomas Aquinas.

Trent brought the Society of Jesus to the fore. Paul III had been so impressed by the Jesuit doctors that he sent them to the Council as papal theologians. Both Julius III and Pius IV followed his example. The latter is said not to have been so favorably disposed to the Society until he recognized in Lainez the most effective defender of papal prerogative. Previous to the Council, the Society, but recently founded, did not rank with the greater Orders: after the Council, its influence could never be ignored, and from this time date its most wide-spread activities.

One aspect of these alone has bearings on the present discussion, namely, the fact that the Jesuits have been apostles of Christian Education. Trent gave sanction to all efforts for the building up of schools, and illustrated an important change in the attitude of the Church toward error. In times past the first thought had been of suppression; hence the Inquisition. Now there was emphasis on the need of correction. Heretics were not to be burned, but to be converted. The methods of the Inquisition were

superseded by those of the Jesuit missionaries. The Council of Trent may be said to have launched the whole modern movement for Catholic schools. One of the cries of Protestantism was for popular education. "Very well," said Trent; "let us have it, the more the better. Only let it be Christian and Catholic." Hence the Jesuits were let loose, together with the Oratorians and the Christian Brothers.

The Church has always been the friend and patron of education, and eminently so in modern times. Against every tendency to reduce education to pagan levels, against every form of so-called religious education which offers maimed or misleading substitutes for the reality, she sets her face like flint: but for education in its completeness, as rounded out in the full context of the Catholic Church, she is always the champion.

The ideal of education perpetuated by Tridentine influence was the synthetic system of the mediæval universities with all the sciences grouped around Theology as their Queen. For long the supreme value of this was not appreciated. The Church held to its mediæval notions, was derided for them, and for long did not herself feel much enthusiasm. Now they are coming to their own. Men are beginning to see that the

despised Philosophy and Theology of Scholasticism are after all superior to the many evanescent inventions proposed as substitutes. The Church has been like the tortoise in the fable. While heretical hares have scampered far afield, got lost, and gone to sleep, she has plodded steadily on in her mediæval shell. Now, rather to her own as to others' surprise, she is obviously nearer the goal than her agile but erratic rivals. While their nimble wits have sampled all errors and defied all conventions, the old Church has not known enough to do anything but stick to the truth. It is now beginning to appear that in all sorts of matters the adepts at "committing the oldest sins the newest kinds of ways" have been mistaken, and the old Church has been right all the time.* Scholastic Philosophy is again in

*Harnack has recently taken up St. Luke, who has, therefore, passed from the rank of exploded superstition to that of pious opinion. Were such things recognized in the University of Berlin, he might even be an article of faith. But the path has been blazed for some audacious Teuton, in an epoch-making monograph, to make a startling discovery of St. John! And all through the ages the old Church has never for a moment given up her Evangelists. Similarly adventurous High Church Anglicans amaze themselves by finding out that their position is Protestant and their Orders invalid: while the old Church has been telling them these things all along, if they had had the sense to listen! *Et cetera.*

vogue; and we are beginning to look back wistfully at the mediæval Universities.

To quote well-weighed words of a distinguished educator.*

The university was, in the educational sphere, the highest expression of that completeness which had all along characterized the teaching of the Church; and the spirit of inquiry which animated the mediæval university remains, in spite of other modifications, the essential element in the university of modern times. The changes which have since taken place have for the most part resulted in separating those elements which the Church had built into an harmonious unity. As Protestantism by rejecting the principle of authority brought about innumerable divisions in belief, so it led to the rupture between Church and State in the matter of education. The Renaissance in its extreme forms ranked pagan culture above everything else; and the Reformation in its fundamental tenet went beyond the individualism which led to the decline of Greek education. Once the schools were secularized, they fell readily under influences which tranformed ideals, systems and methods. Philosophy detached from theology formulated new theories of life and its values, that moved, at first slowly then more rapidly, away from the positive teaching of Christianity. Science in turn cast off its allegiance to philosophy and finally proclaimed itself the only kind of knowledge worth seeking. The most serious practical result

* Dr. Pace in *The Catholic Encyclopædia.*

was the separation of moral and religious from purely intellectual education—a result which was due in part to religious differences and political changes, but also in large part to erroneous views concerning the nature and need of moral training. Such views again are in general derived from the denial, explicit or implicit, of the supernatural order, and of its meaning for human life in its relations to God; so that, during three centuries past, the main endeavor outside the Catholic Church has been to establish education on a purely naturalistic basis, whether this be æsthetic culture or scientific knowledge, individual perfection or social service. In its earlier stages Protestantism, which laid so much stress on faith, could not consistently have sanctioned an education from which religious ideals were eliminated. But according as its principles worked out to their legitimate consequences, it became less and less capable of opposing the naturalistic movement. The Catholic Church has thus been obliged to carry on, with little or no help from other Christian bodies, the struggle in behalf of those truths on which Christianity is founded; and her educational work during the modern period may be described in general terms as the steadfast maintenance of the union between the natural and the supernatural.

3. The most obvious and characteristic work of the Council of Trent was its proclamation of Doctrine. This was always the first consideration in the minds of the Tridentine fathers. Sovereigns might wish them to conciliate Protes-

tants; their own special concern was to recall them from their errors. As they stated in their first decree, which concerned the Creed, the two chief purposes for which they had been assembled were "the extirpation of heresies and the reformation of morals." Popular estimation might reverse the order; but not they. Good morals depended on restoration of right Faith: hence they sought to confute error by clear proclamation of those aspects of truth which were specially assailed.* To stem the inroads of Protestantism

* The first decree, *Decretum de Symbolo Fidei,* begins thus: "This holy œcumenical and general Council of Trent, duly assembled in the Holy Spirit, under presidency of three legates of the Apostolic See, considering the magnitude of matters to be dealt with, especially of those which fall under the two heads, exstirpation of heresies and reformation of morals, for which chiefly the Council has been assembled; recognizing also with St. Paul that our conflict is not against flesh and blood, but against spiritual wickedness in high places; with him the Council urges each and all in the first instance that they be strong in the Lord and in the power of His might, taking in all things the shield of faith, whereby they are able to quench all the fiery darts of the devil, and may put on the helmet of the hope of salvation, with the sword of the Spirit which is the Word of God. Therefore, that this devout purpose may have its beginning and progress by the grace of God, before all things the Council determines and decrees that it must not neglect to confess its faith, following in this regard the examples of the fathers

they sent forth an army of missionaries, headed by the Jesuits, whose success in checking the spread of heresy is the most striking feature of the counter-Reformation. Back of this militant activity, and most indicative of the attitude of the Church, was the Tridentine Definition of Faith. Protestantism had raised certain doctrinal questions: the Church, fully and fearlessly, indifferent to the exigencies of secular politics, gave doctrinal answers. Politicians, unconcerned for the claims of revealed truth, might try to stop doctrinal discussions: the Church, conscious of her teaching function, refused to be stopped. She reaffirmed every doctrine which had been assailed; she condemned every error of the assailants. As attacks were chiefly made upon her use of Sacraments, from Trent issued her classic statement of Catholic sacramental doctrine. It is not the purpose of this paper to discuss doctrine: but one main aspect of the Tridentine Decrees of Doctrine may be indicated.

The Definitions of Trent gave the stamp of authority to the current doctrine of the Schools,

who in the most venerable councils were accustomed in the past at the outset of their proceedings to oppose this shield against all heresies. In this way alone did they ever recall the unfaithful to the faith, overthrow heretics, and strengthen the faithful."

accepting the ordered results of mediæval thought. Protestants wished to relegate these to obscurity, and raised cries of "Back to Scripture," "Back to the early Fathers." Since fashions of theology and philosophy change, it was conceivable that, in the atmosphere created by the Renaissance with its preference for classical antiquity, "Gothic" philosophy and theology might share the unpopularity of "Gothic" art, that the Church might revert to the less developed modes of expression of her earlier time. There were precedents for conciliar efforts to set the clock back. For Trent to have done this would have been to deny the Church's continuous evolution, and to have seemed to acquiesce to some degree in the Protestant assumption that at some definite point in the past the Church had abandoned her line of life for bypaths of "corruption," that Truth and the Church had been lost, and that both must be newly devised. In what was done and in what was not done, the Council's instinct led to reaffirmation of the Church's doctrines in their scholastic form, not as an act of policy and self-vindication, but as an exhibition of uncompromising loyalty to the mode and principle of revelation.

Trent expressed the Church's formal approval

of Scholasticism by giving authoritative sanction to what had been made actual and practical in thirteenth century achievements, thus fixing the standard for the future. Here was a coherent doctrinal programme for the missionaries of the Counter-Reformation in their effort to stem the tide of innovation. It was a practical canonization of St. Thomas Aquinas. More than any other he had been responsible for the comprehensive exposition of all Christian thought, the correlation of all parts and aspects of the truth, for the logical elaboration of Christian theology. The achievements of his consecrated intellect had been the crowning product of the thirteenth century's intellectual development. His version of Christian truth, his adaptation of Aristotle in Christian philosophy, had been prevalent for two centuries and a half; yet it had not been for the whole Church formally authorized. Trent made it standard. In the Dominican church in Florence there is a great fresco representing St. Thomas enthroned amid the Arts and Sciences, the Philosophers and Theologians, as supreme Doctor of the Church. So had he long been regarded by his Order; so had he been esteemed by the inner circle of the Church's scholars: now this preeminence was proclaimed in the Church

by adoption of the sacramental theology of which the Angelic Doctor had been chief exponent.

As against the tendency to supersede Catholic theology by dogmas of Protestant eclecticism, Trent exalted the teaching of the schoolmen as natural successors of the ancient fathers: as against the tendency to supersede Christian philosophy by guess-work prompted by materialistic presuppositions, she held to the characteristic products of mediæval thought. She refused to surrender what was logically and legitimately Christian for what she recognized as potentially pagan. She was dealing with the beginnings of Modernism. In the outcry against her doctrine and use of Sacraments she detected fundamental opposition to the supernatural. She consistently recognized the continuity and gradual evolution of Christian thought and life against the assumption that truth died with St. Paul only to be resurrected in Luther. She was witness to the oneness of the Church's mind, gradually educated by indwelling of the Holy Ghost. *Ecclesiæ docenti, quia Ecclesia, est docendum.*

It cannot justly be urged that this represents intransigeant reaction. It is not refusal to go ahead, but refusal to go back, refusal to go off at heretical tangents instead of adhering to the

corporate mind of the Church. As against the fashion of individual random shots at truth, the Council stands for definite Christianity exhibited in ordered progress, indicating the one safe line of intellectual advance within the inspired life of the Catholic Church. Protecting what had been won, and at the same time throwing out lines of reconnoissance for discoveries farther afield, its conservatism was the guarantee of progress, its confirmation of the past assured the future.

4. As with Doctrine, so with Government. Reform was dependent on the maintenance of true doctrine, and also of legitimate authority. Granting that things were not altogether right in the Church, it did not help matters to cure the disease by killing the patient. As the outcry against abuses largely concerned Pope, Curia and Priesthood, it was conceivable that there should be modification at least in matters affecting the hierarchy. The thirteenth century had seen Popes and Prelates making good their claim to rule Europe in the Name of Christ. Yet in the subsequent period there had been notable loss of prestige. The Schism of the fourteenth century, the luxurious worldliness of the fifteenth, the futile efforts at recovery in the sixteenth, had occasioned a very general feeling that the old

theory of Pope and Hierarchy must be regarded as obsolete. Protestants said so then, and have been saying so ever since. In the Church too there was question of the legitimacy of some applications of the principle of papal autocracy, as was reflected in debates of the Council itself. The permanence of the hierarchy under its mediæval forms was considered doubtful by many at the time. It had been overthrown in England and Germany, what of its fate elsewhere?

Trent met this question decisively. Not by formal enactments, but, more effectively, by in every way recognizing *de facto* authority as *de jure* secure. In the relevant discussions the papal claims were always sustained: the acts of the Council were submitted to the Pope for approval, interpretation, and promulgation: all doubtful questions were left to his sole decision. In its acts and in its refusals to act, it gave sanction to the mediæval form of papal supremacy in the Church, and to the related hierarchy as being logical, legitimate and useful. "Centralization is the organization of unity." There were many movements away from unity, some national, some due to the activity of demagogues. Protestantism was essentially disintegrating. Trent

stood for solidarity. In the Christian commonwealth, it refused to recognize rifts along racial, national or political lines. As against attempts to create them, it exalted the authority of the Apostolic Chair, the symbol and instrument of unity, Divinely established in St. Peter, and by the Church adapted as her bulwark against anarchy. The existing hierarchy was the extension of the apostolate instituted by Our Lord. It was not to be exchanged for newly-devised bodies of state- or congregational-officials. The Infallibility of the Church, guaranteed by a Divine promise, was more easily credible than the assumed infallibility of certain arrogant individuals.

The Apostolic Church is essentially hierarchical. Our Lord made her so by entrusting it to the Twelve. Trent protected this principle of authority in the Church, as Divinely given and sacramentally perpetuated, by standing squarely against every effort to subject it to princes or self-constituted prophets. A single Church, not a dozen national Churches; a world-wide Church, not one of exclusive groups; a Church with authority derived from God above, not delegated by man below: the Church, that is, One, Catholic

ST. ALBERT'S COLLEGE LIBRARY

and Apostolic—that is what Trent was standing for in its loyalty to Petrine primacy.

5. This leads directly to consideration of a fifth aspect of the Council, inclusive of the others, its witness to the Church. It is emphatically the Council of the Church Principle. The Protestant revolution struck at this by putting forth a new assumption concerning the mode of salvation. Almighty God revealed Himself through the Incarnate Son. The Son, to extend the means of salvation to all men, called into being a society, existing first in His Apostles, a Body of which He was Head. To this society He promised His perpetual presence and the infallible guidance of His Holy Spirit. Christianity and the Church were identical. The Catholic Church, conscious throughout her history of the presence of her Lord and of the controlling influence of the Holy Spirit, has refused to be disloyal to the principle of her being, the mode of salvation Divinely appointed, the guarantee of the perpetuity of revelation.

Protestantism abandoned this. It remembered nothing apparently except that from the first generations of Christians had come precious writings which the Church had treasured. It now assumed that Christianity was simply what

anyone could imagine for himself by poring over modern translations of these early documents. For the Divine Person and the Divine Society it substituted the notion of a man with a book. (In its latest developments the man dispenses with the book.) It conceived, therefore, that Christian individuals may exist here and there, that is, men with notions; that these may join in groups to form congregations; that congregations may coalesce into communions: and at present it is often suggested that these communions might loosely federate to form a Catholic Church. Its thought starts, not from the idea of the One Family into which men are born one by one, but with spontaneously generated units, who, as it were, choose parents and family by popular election! This reverses the whole process as established by Almighty God. It is built on the shifting sands of mere individualism, is a tower reared from below whereby men seek to reach heaven: and the result of the effort now, as in the similar attempt in Old Testament, is merely confusion of tongues, Babel. The Church cannot countenance this presupposition without being false to herself. She cannot confer about Faith and Order by

seeming to make tacit admissions destructive of both.

Trent was consistently loyal to the principle of the Church. It invited Protestants to conference, but did not abdicate its lawful supremacy. In a time when the Church-principle was exposed to assault, it expressed it in its decrees and exhibited it in action. There had been danger that this might be obscured by the wordliness with which ecclesiastical life had been infected. Trent recalled the Church to her true line. All its insistence on continuity, intellectual and social, bore witness to continuity in the Church, to the truth of Our Lord's promise to be with His Church and sustain it to the end. Protestantism everywhere was rejecting the idea of the Church's permanence. Against this, as trustee for the future Christianity of the world, Trent stood for the One Church, unchanging because Divine.

To believe in the Church is to recognize her supremacy: and this is but to recognize the authority of Revelation. If God has spoken, man can but listen: if God has given commands, man can but obey. The modern individualistic notion is all against this. God has done nothing, it assumes, but put us in the world to muddle

along as best we may. All we can do is to have a guess at what it all means; and one man's guess is as good as another's. This is the assumption of many about us as a result of the breaks from the Church in the sixteenth century. It was assumed then that revelation was dependent upon individual interpretation: it is assumed now to be a mere matter of individual imagination. The authority of Revelation and the very idea of Revelation were at stake then, and have been in jeopardy ever since.

In opposition to these fatal tendencies the stand of Trent was like that of St. Peter. When men were talking about Christ and saying all manner of conflicting things, he was not confused since he was conscious that the band of Apostles had Our Lord in possession. "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the Living God." "Lord, to whom shall we go? Thou hast the words of eternal life." To some then, as now, Christianity was nothing but vague talk about Christ. St. Peter knew better. It was possession and being possessed. This possession was more than nine points of such law as was given by Moses; it was actual experience of the grace and truth that came by Jesus Christ. It is to that confident assurance of possession, Tridentine as well as

Petrine, that Our Lord gave His great promise about the Church, whose secret had been revealed not by flesh and blood, but by the Father in heaven. It is this confidence of possession that gives the secret of permanence, Tridentine as well as Petrine, against which the very gates of Hell are powerless.

IV

THE TRIDENTINE ATTITUDE

IV

The Tridentine Attitude

There are practical lessons to be learned from the attitude of the Council of Trent. This was determined chiefly by three things: uncompromising loyalty to Catholic truth, discriminating treatment of those in error, tactful preservation of Catholic unity. In each of the three, it established precedents for the Church in recent times, its action for foreshadowing subsequent dealings with the later forms of Modernism. There was nothing original in the Protestant revolution, nor in the Church's way of meeting the issues raised. History was merely repeating itself on a large scale. The attitude of Trent simply maintained the Church's natural pose: yet, in details, it indicated the best mode of approach to old problems in their newest guise. It stood for two things; the uncompromising rejection of Protestant presuppositions, and the unambiguous declaration of the Catholic Faith. It was concerned less with proclaiming its own dogmas in refutation of the dogmas of heretics, than with showing the opposition between the definite and historic Chris-

tian religion and a tendency to uncertainty and utter vagueness, between the Church and innumerable private judgments. Through the Council the Church was disclosing her self-consciousness of being "the extension of the Incarnation," dealing with sixteenth century problems not only as they actually presented themselves, but with foresight of whither they were leading. She was facing not merely a number of rebels against her authority, but a fatal principle of rebellion.

It is not possible to dismiss problems raised by Protestantism by mere condemnation of the abstractions represented by Luther and Calvin and Henry VIII. No one in these days exactly follows in the footsteps of any of them. Their peculiar opinions and positions scarcely survived themselves, though the consequences of their wilfulness live on in forms of indifference and agnosticism. Protestantism must be tested not only by its origins, but also by the ultimate results of its tendencies. Anyone who believes in revelation, and in the Church as revelation's channel and custodian, can note that the origins were criminal and the tendencies disastrous. But account must also be taken of the fact that Protestantism usually exists in undeveloped stages. Its habitual distaste for authority and the super-

natural are habitually inconsistent. It is saved from itself by virtue of its defects. Any believer in historic Christianity must see its preparations for the process of religion's evaporation: yet he will not fail to see that most Protestants are in ways very excellent Christians and much in earnest to make the most of the Christianity they know. Wholesale theories have to be held in check by retail facts.

For example. Of all Protestants, none are farther removed from Catholics in their attitude toward the idea of the Church and Sacraments than the Society of Friends. Any theologian can make short work of their theories, and, if he have a sense of the ludicrous, can have a lively time with their absurdities. He is bound to condemn their presuppositions as radically false, and to see that some of their ways are supremely ridiculous. Yet, if he has actual acquaintance with Quakers, he knows that many of them are kindly, charitable, lovable people, exhibiting a "love, joy and peace" which are unmistakable "fruits of the Spirit," in which he sees intimations of Divine recognition of their good faith. Although rejecting the Church which makes belief in the Holy Spirit practical, they have an intense belief in the Spirit's presence and activity

through possession of a fundamentally Catholic instinct: and no sincere lover of good things and good men can fail to thank God for the virtues of His Quaker saints. The Catholic will only regret that those who have so much should not have much more: he will claim their virtues as truly Catholic, and insist that the one true home for these is the Church. He will see plainly that they do not carry their negative principles to the limit of practical conclusion.

Protestantism started with rejection of portions of the Church's faith: its rejections have been varied and progressive: in some cases they have become total. Yet in most instances the rejections have been less strange than the retentions. Why, if they protested against so much, did they not protest against more? Why will they not accept more, when already they accept so much? All Protestantism is inconsistency, a refusal to carry distinctive principles to full consequences, a failure to ascribe good consequences to their true causes. The good things in Protestantism are the parts of Catholicity it has not given up. "The Bible and the Bible only," of which it once wished to make a religion, came from the Church and the Church only: and it is in the Church and the Church only that the Bible

is still reasonably interpreted and sincerely believed. Protestantism is Christianity on the road to annihilation with only half a mind to follow it. Its hesitations are saving graces. No Catholic, with sense of fairness and shrewd concern for the interests of religion, can fail to see what good people most Protestants are, and to know not only that they need the Church, but also that the Church needs them.

This is strikingly true in America. The thirteen colonies which formed the United States were, with the exception of Maryland, Protestant foundations. The sprinkling of Catholics in them little affected their early development. So far as the American commonwealths had religious foundations, they had them from English, Dutch and Swedish Protestants who played the chief part in their early history. To value American institutions is to value certain consequences of this influence. To judge that influence aright, it must also be seen that the good in it comes from the part of Catholic Christianity which had not been rejected. Protestants have no hold of truth which Catholics do not possess in its full context.

Moreover, unfortunate premises were never carried to full conclusions. Massachusetts never

wholly applied Calvinistic theology: its Puritans were never half so unlovely as their Genevan creed might have made them. Virginia never wholly lost sight of the sacramental hints in its Prayer Book, although greatly inclined to do so. Pennsylvania never appropriated all the Quaker impracticalities; nor did New York and New Jersey confine themselves to the narrow gauge of their Dutch. Politically the American colonies reflected something more than the outcome of local needs; and this was the ideal of law and liberty in the British Constitution. Religiously there was always a sense of something cramping in the rigid moulds of the queer sects, always a groping for something larger and stabler; and this was an instinctive longing for the law and liberty of the Catholic Church.

The Church is the true home of all that is sound in American aspiration and achievement. Catholics must appreciate this, for Catholicism is not only an ecclesiastical system, but also an intellectual and temperamental attitude. It thinks and feels, as well as legislates, in terms of the world. It expresses the big mind and big heart of Christianity from which nothing human is alien. Its genius, as distinct from sectarian limitations, is shown in the appropriation, corre-

lation, and harmonious combination, of all the varieties in human life and in human society. It is in its element in dealing with the complex problems of a composite people, and alone has the key to discovery of stable unity and morality. It has therefore unique possibilities of usefulness in such a country as the United States, where there is special need therefore of imitating the attitude of the fathers in the Council of Trent.

1. First, in their loyalty, their unflinching witness to the definiteness of the Christian faith in face of vagaries and vagueness. The only true charity is sincerity. There are many duties of sympathy, patience and considerateness: but these do not justify playing fast and loose with principle. Rather the contrary. Conciliatoriness in temper does not mean compromise of the truth. The only good policy, because the only right conduct, is unflinching loyalty to the faith. The truth must be "spoken in love": but love will speak nothing but truth. There must be infinite tact and patience in dealing with troubled minds and souls: but there is no excuse, or justification in results, for uncandid suppression of any part of the Church's teaching. People who are genuinely in earnest want nothing but the truth and the whole of it: those who seek self-

justification, from pride of opinion or petty vanity, obviously lack the motives which lead to genuine conversion. Fairness and sympathy in dealing with another's difficulties must go hand in hand with downright honesty in the statement of one's own position. Sincere people can always understand each other, no matter on how many topics they disagree. The only thing sincere people care for, regardless of all consequences, is the truth, all of it, and nothing else. Hostility to what is false, as well as sympathy with imperfect good, is a cardinal point in Catholic justice and policy. In sincerity is the only true charity; in charity alone actual sincerity. Charity makes men sincere; sincerity makes them charitable.

2. Trent was inflexibly loyal to the Faith: but it showed discrimination in its dealings with those in error, making it clear that its aim was conversion rather than condemnation. The example thus set may well be remembered in these days, when it must often be recognized that non-Catholicism is not necessarily anti-Catholicism. It sometimes is. The Church is known for what it stands and is hated in consequence. This must not be ignored. The Church must face and unmask opposition as Our Lord did. "Ye have seen and hated both Me and My Father." When

it is known what Our Lord teaches and is, failure to own Him as Lord is opposition. "He that is not with Me is against Me." When the Church is understood and men hold aloof, failure to co-operate, neglect to enlist in her service, is tacit rejection. In the face of what are known to be Divine claims there can be no neutrality. "He that is not with is against."

Yet there is a complementary principle expressed in "He that is not against us is on our side." The sons of Zebedee had forbidden one casting out devils in Christ's Name because he did not belong to the apostolic band. Our Lord said, "Forbid him not, for he that is not against us is on our side." Here was one doing apostolic work in all good faith, though not an apostle. Our Lord commended him and rebuked St. John. The outsider was serving Christ as best he knew, and though not of the army, was doing useful service as a volunteer scout. Inaction with knowledge is rejection: but service, though imperfect through ignorance, must always be recognized as loyalty. The principle which applies to those who know has no bearings on those who are ignorant. Even of those who unwittingly had share in "crucifying the Lord of glory," Our

Lord prayed "Father, forgive them, for they know not."

Among non-Catholics the number who really understand what the Church is and hate her is comparatively small. In most cases aloofness and opposition are due to ignorance. Those outside are trying to serve Christ in the best ways they know, and are the Church's undeveloped friends and unsuspected allies. This must be remembered by all who have tasks of winning for the Church the "other sheep not of this fold." In the great majority of cases, people outside the Church, with all sorts of queer notions about her, are not at heart opposed. They have had no chance to know. Ignorance and separation are due to no fault of their own, but are the handicap of heredity and environment. It is easy to condemn those responsible for the divisions in Christendom, not those who have merely inherited them. The former are criminals, the latter their victims. In dealing with anomalies in the Christian world, it is consoling to reflect that none now living have caused them, that few can be blamed for wilful continuance of them. It is also comforting to reflect that in America do not exist such barriers as separate Catholics and Protestants in certain parts of Europe. In

England and Ireland, for example, Catholics have experience as well as memory of rooted distrust and suspicion in their neighbors, of oppression and persecution by the government in a Protestant State. It is impossible for them not to feel that they are objects of hatred on account of their faith. Nothing of the kind is true in America. American Protestants, for the most part, do not share their convictions, and are a bit amused at some of their notions; but they wish to be friendly, to cooperate in all possible ways, and to welcome their Catholic fellow-citizens to all the freedom of what they feel is peculiarly their own national life. They are usually ready to go more than half way in making friendly advances. There is absence of sympathetic understanding, but no hostility.

One may illustrate these things from the religious history of New England where these words are written. New England has a history of three hundred years; but never until the present time has it fair opportunity to know about the Catholic Church. Consider the facts. It is true that the actual religious beginnings were Catholic. Mass was said in Maine as far back as 1608: Jesuit missionaries from Canada early penetrated New England's borders. Yet

these preliminary accidents were but happy portents. The Pilgrims landed at Plymouth in 1620; thousands of Puritans followed them during the subsequent fifty years: Dutch came from New York into Connecticut. All these people were Protestants and proceeded to build up in New England a number of Protestant commonwealths. They brought from England and Holland the only religion they knew. The first settlers were none of them Catholics.* They were grandchildren and great-grandchildren of those who had been robbed of Catholicism by the tyranny of the English State. They knew of Catholicism only as the bogy of Protestant myth. It had been banished from the lands of their birth for several generations before their time. The bugbear which chiefly exercised their pious antipathies was the Church of England which they knew, rather than the Scarlet Woman of tradition, the unknown Church of Rome. Having placed the barrier of the Atlantic, in days when the Atlantic was a barrier, between themselves and the politics and religions of Europe, they proceeded to develop the "town-meeting," and as its ecclesiastical analogue, a form of Con-

* It is difficult to be convinced by the arguments for the Catholicism of Miles Standish!

gregationalism which was a purely American product. Six generations of them were Congregationalists, for the excellent reason that they could not have been anything else. Congregationalism was "the Standing Order"; and there were summary ways of disposing of witches, Quakers, Episcopalians, and other objectionable curiosities, who refused to take an orderly stand!

With the nineteenth century came change. There was growing restiveness under the rigors of Calvinist theology which the first settlers had imported and adapted. With the possibilities of change inherent in the congregational system, many became Unitarians, Episcopalians, Universalists, or various forms of nothing in particular. New Englanders came to know something of the local modifications of Protestantism, but of Catholicism nothing as yet. Little streams of French Catholicism had trickled from Canada into Maine and Vermont, other small streams from Europe with the immigrants who came to the large cities: but not until the height of the tide of Irish immigration in the middle of the century, did Catholics appear in such numbers as to make Catholicism an appreciable power. Even then it was for a long time an alien thing to representatives of the ten generations who had

made New England. To them the newly-arrived immigrants were "foreigners," and the religion they imported regarded as a reminiscence of Europe, likely to be discarded by them or their descendants, once they became identified with American life. Religously people often live in water-tight compartments: and Congregationalists and Catholics have had queer notions of each other. New Englanders could not be blamed for knowing nothing directly of the Catholic Church. For two centuries there was no Catholic Church in New England for them to know: and then, for most of another, none so existing that they could know it.

Now has come a change. No longer can observant people, especially if they be sincere in their Christian professions, fail to take account of the greatest religious body in the country, or fail to be conscious of its presence close at hand. The Church is beginning to be known directly by the kinds of people who have heretofore lived altogether apart from it. The result is a large number of conversions. Last spring, the converts in the archdiocese of Boston for a year were rounded up at a single Confirmation. There were a thousand of them, largely representatives of the rigid conservatism of Puritan New Eng-

land. In most instances, they had recently had their first chances to know anything at first-hand of the Catholic Church; and prejudices had vanished like morning-mists. Those who had the preparation of them found that they were not at bottom opposed to the Church, but had simply grown up apart from it. Their non-Catholicism was not anti-Catholicism, merely enforced exile from their true home.

3. The Tridentine attitude is resolute in its loyalty and just in its sympathies: it is also consistently aiming at maintenance of Catholic unity. The Council of Trent had to deal with various parties and interests among Catholics, and out of marked diversity succeeded in maintaining unity. This aspect of its action has especial interest for Americans, since along this line there are unique opportunities for American Catholicism. Not that Catholicism can be cramped into a national mould. A national religion *ipso facto* ceases to be Catholicism; yet there may be something national in the way Catholicism goes about its work. (K.C. is an instance in point!) The nations of the world all have places and characteristic functions in the City of God: and one of the American functions is to exhibit harmonious cooperation of divers elements in

Catholicism and fair dealings with the Christian world.

In this country, all forms of Christianity meet on common ground, face to face. They cannot think of each other as phenomena peculiar to remote parts of the world. Close contact involves more or less interrelation. Those who are not coreligionists are nevertheless fellow-citizens; and of the religous phases of national life all are more or less conscious. The Catholic Church in this country must constantly take account of the non-Catholic world. In Spain, Italy, Poland, even in France or Ireland, this might not be necessary; but not so here. The Catholic Church in America can never ignore the many American Christians outside her pale, nor forget her contrasting duties of sympathy and antagonism, of loyalty to truth and compassion for souls. She has duties to all who bear the Christian name as well as to her own children.

Trent set an example of comprehensive combination of all elements in the Church itself. There is something akin to this in American ideals. If "the American idea" stands for one thing more than another, it is for blending, for combination, for all the processes of "the melting-pot." Our national problem has been the

amalgamation of heterogeneous racial elements, the evolution of national unity out of masses having widely different antecedents. We have had to deal with diversities at close quarters, and have always been aiming at unities. Out of manifold experience, we have learned much of the science and arts of unification. The national political problem has its analogue in the national religious problem; and the latter is merely local illustration of the ubiquitous problem of the Catholic Church. America affords special opportunities for laboratory practice in the Church's ways of bringing together those who, though of many sorts, are fundamentally one in faith and aims.

Thus far there have been three chapters in the history of American Catholicism: the presage of Catholic discovery; the arrival of Catholic colonies: the federation of these in the one Catholic Church of America. The first two concern periods of missionary activity. During the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, something was done by Catholics from French America on the north, along the Great Lakes and in the Mississippi, and by Catholics from Spanish America on the south, in Florida, the southwest and California, to introduce Catholicism into

territory eventually to be absorbed into the State created by English America, the beginnings of which were Protestant. This constitutes a first chapter. The second has to do with about seventy years of the nineteenth century, during which incoming colonies of Catholics from Europe became unknown to themselves the outposts for missionary work. In the providence of God, it is the Catholic Irish who have had chief share in this. For a century after the beginning of the great immigrations, it was natural that there should be congregations of Irish Catholics in all the cities, in many too of German Catholics, in some of Polish Catholics, of Spanish, of Portuguese, of French. These Catholic congregations in America were but colonies of Catholics from Europe. It is natural still that old associations should be kept up, that traditional antecedents should give interesting color to Catholic parish life. But the time has long gone by when American Catholicism can be a reproduction in miniature of the map of Catholic Europe. The Bishops have always been trying to do away with that notion; and for fifty years at least, it has been evident to everybody that the Church had left its colonial period behind; that, as the thirteen colonies of European derivation had to federate

into one American Commonwealth, so must these colonies of Catholics lose their distinctiveness in the common life of the American Catholic Church.

During the period of construction by amalgamation, American unity and Catholic unity have helped each other. The common religious bond has drawn together many bands of new citizens of the country; the common bond of citizenship has served to blot out lines of division created by variety in ecclesiastical antecedents. Both bonds ought to intensify the sense of human brotherhood, of unity in diversity, of which America and Catholicity alike are, in their respective spheres, equally symbols and guarantees. The Church, which is One in all the world, ought to present a spectacle of peculiar unity in itself in a land where its sons, derived from many races, possess not only the one faith, but have also the one citizenship. The unity of the Church in this nation ought to afford a striking exhibition of the unity of the Church in all time and in all the world.

During this critical period of the Church's firm establishment in America, there has been one outstanding figure, the personification of her temper and her aims, that of James Cardinal Gibbons.

To his lot has fallen the task of special guidance during the period of permanent construction. If there be one thing more than another for which his remarkable career stands, it is for this idea of unity: one faith, one citizenship; no foreign politics, no home-grown religions; unity among Catholics, unity among Americans, as the result of downright loyalty to conviction and of the just sympathy of human brotherhood. The broad vision of a watchman on a high tower can correct the petty and partial views of those who have not his post of vantage. The Cardinal has given an example of a great Catholic who is a good American, and of a good American because he is a Catholic.*

It is not mere national vanity or boast of achievement, but rather a sober recognition of responsibility and opportunity, to say that American Catholicism may stand in special ways for unflinching loyalty to the ancient faith and for versatile adaptability in applying it to present needs. If it does this, it will be keeping alive the spirit of the Tridentine fathers as well as

* This is left as it was written. Cardinal Gibbons had the manuscript of these lectures sent to him and read the first part two weeks before his death.

F. J. K.

that of St. Paul, who was "all things to all men," because he was but one thing to Almighty God, His "servant and the bond-slave of Jesus Christ." To do this is simply to follow in the line of the conquests of the Cross.

PRINTED IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

14,963 262.5
K35
Kinsman, Frederick
m14,
AUTHOR
Trent, Four Lectures...
TITLE

ST. ALBERT'S COLLEGE LIBRARY